

Citizenship Education and ‘*Bildung*’: Learning from “the Norwegian way”

**A case study of teaching and learning democracy
in a Norwegian junior high school**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Political Science

Elizabeth Plew

**University of Canterbury
2014**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My biggest thank you goes to Dr Bronwyn Hayward, my supervisor, for her ideas, encouragement and support, both from the other side of the world in New Zealand and on her Norwegian visits. This thesis became truly interesting and stretching for me because she saw its possibilities. I am also very grateful to Dr Kathleen Quinlivan as my associate supervisor, whose thoughtful comments always helped to provide a balanced view: together you made a great team.

To Professor Karen O'Brien and Dr Elin Selboe at the University of Oslo, thanks for your support as part of the Voices of the Future project. This assistance enabled me to attend the Transformation Conference in Oslo, and Elin's emails encouraged me while living and studying with a young family in a foreign country. Dr Janicke Stray (University of Oslo) also deserves my thanks for reading through the Norwegian chapter and her helpful comments in shaping the findings.

I am also grateful for the University of Canterbury Masters Scholarship that helped to make my studies financially viable. I hope that this work honours the university's contribution.

To the Norwegian case study school and others I interviewed in Trondheim – all I can say is 'tusen takk' (a thousand thanks)! Thank you for sharing what is special about Norwegian democracy. It was an amazing experience for me to visit, observe and talk with you about your school, what you think and what you do when it comes to democracy.

Special thanks also go to Astrid Elisabeth, my interpreter. Without her I would not have achieved what I did in terms of collecting the data. Your support in interviews, amazing level of English and ability to interpret were truly a godsend. To my other friends in Norway (both Norwegian and expat) I am very grateful for the friendship and support you gave us while we lived there.

To other friends, academic colleagues and wider family – many of you listened to my struggles and our adventures and encouraged me to keep going. In particular, many thanks go to my parents, Graham and Judi, for the hours of babysitting and political discussion about what I have learned, and especially your visit to Norway to see us. A big thank you goes to my sister Catherine too, for her ongoing support and encouragement, both here in New Zealand and by Skype.

And finally, to my wonderful husband David, without whom a 'year in Norway' would not have happened. Thank you for your wholehearted (and practical) support and unwavering belief in my ability to finish, and your willingness to travel the world with me - it was a great adventure we will never forget!

I dedicate this work to Lara and Karena, my lovely children who make me proud to be their mother. Here's to your future – I hope that in sharing what I have learned we can make our democratic country a better place for generations to come.

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Abstract..... | 6 |
| Chapter 1. Debates about teaching citizenship and democracy in education | 7 |
| 1.1 Introduction | 7 |
| 1.2 Young people and participation..... | 7 |
| 1.3 Defining democratic citizenship..... | 8 |
| 1.4 Citizenship education in school: purpose and practice | 11 |
| 1.5 Understanding education debates around the curriculum | 11 |
| 1.6 Models of citizenship: what is citizenship educating for? | 12 |
| 1.7 Democratic practice in schools – what does it look like? | 14 |
| 1.8 Understanding democratic philosophy and practice within a formal curriculum..... | 14 |
| 1.8.1 Underpinning philosophy: the European concept of <i>Bildung</i> | 15 |
| 1.8.2 Participatory learning approaches..... | 17 |
| 1.8.3 Practising deliberation | 17 |
| 1.8.4 Relationships between teachers and students..... | 18 |
| 1.9 Understanding democratic practice within the informal curriculum | 18 |
| 1.10 Shaping the research questions..... | 20 |
| 1.11 Conclusion and thesis structure..... | 21 |
| Chapter 2. Democracy and citizenship education in Norway..... | 22 |
| 2.1 Introduction: Why Norway? | 22 |
| 2.2 Norway the democracy..... | 22 |
| 2.3 Understanding educational policy tensions in Norway | 23 |
| 2.4 Levels of civic engagement among young Norwegians | 25 |
| 2.5 The challenges of immigration and multiculturalism – education implications..... | 26 |
| 2.6 Citizenship education in Norwegian schools: contemporary debate | 27 |
| 2.7 Democratic practice within the Norwegian school..... | 27 |
| 2.8 Research questions revisited | 29 |
| 2.9 Conclusion | 29 |
| Chapter 3. Research methods..... | 30 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 30 |
| 3.2 Methods used for researching citizenship education in schools..... | 30 |
| 3.3 Pros and cons of a qualitative case study approach..... | 33 |
| 3.4 Why choose a case study? | 34 |

| | |
|--|----|
| 3.5 Cultural research considerations | 36 |
| 3.6 Sampling strategies | 37 |
| 3.7 Research validity and reliability | 37 |
| 3.8 Ethics | 39 |
| 3.9 Data collection methods | 40 |
| 3.9.1 Documentation | 40 |
| 3.9.2 Interviews..... | 40 |
| 3.9.3 Direct observations | 41 |
| 3.10 Data analysis | 41 |
| 3.11 Summary of research methodology | 41 |
| 3.12 Conclusion | 42 |
| Chapter 4. The case study: Practising democracy in a Norwegian <i>ungdomsskole</i> | 43 |
| 4.1 Introduction | 43 |
| 4.2 Data collection | 43 |
| 4.2.1 Interviews and focus groups | 44 |
| 4.2.2 Observations | 45 |
| 4.2.3 Writing topics..... | 46 |
| 4.3 Findings 1: How is democracy and citizenship understood in the Norwegian curriculum? | 47 |
| 4.3.1 Democracy across the curriculum..... | 47 |
| 4.3.2 Views of citizenship: freedom, equality and the Norwegian Constitution | 50 |
| 4.3.3 How much do societal/parental views and values uphold school learning about democracy and citizenship? | 54 |
| 4.4 Findings 2. How is democracy practised in the formal curriculum? | 57 |
| 4.4.1 Understanding the <i>Bildung</i> learning approach..... | 59 |
| 4.4.2 Participatory learning approaches..... | 62 |
| 4.4.3 Practising deliberation | 67 |
| 4.4.4 Relationships between teachers and students..... | 76 |
| 4.5 Findings 3. How is democracy practised in the informal curriculum? | 81 |
| 4.5.1 The Student Council | 81 |
| 4.5.2 Theme weeks | 83 |
| 4.5.3 Political clubs..... | 84 |
| 4.5.4 Other school representative committees | 85 |
| 4.6 Conclusion | 86 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Chapter 5. Discussion of findings and future implications for citizenship education and deliberative theory..... | 87 |
| 5.1 Introduction | 87 |
| 5.2 Reflections for schools and policy-makers in other established democracies: | 87 |
| Norwegian successes and challenges | 88 |
| 5.2.1 Across the curriculum | 88 |
| 5.2.2 In the formal curriculum | 88 |
| 5.2.3 In the informal curriculum | 90 |
| 5.3 Considerations of CE for other established democracies | 90 |
| 5.4 Final conclusions | 91 |
| Appendix 1: Principal Questions | 93 |
| Appendix 2: Teacher Questions | 94 |
| Appendix 3: Student Questions | 95 |
| Appendix 4: Parent Information form | 96 |
| Appendix 5: Consent form | 97 |
| Appendix 6: Teacher Questions (Norwegian) | 98 |
| Appendix 7: Parent Information form (Norwegian) | 99 |
| Appendix 8: Consent form (Norwegian) | 100 |
| References | 101 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1.1 Nussbaum's model for educating citizens | 13 |
| Table 1.2 Westheimer and Kahne's model for kinds of citizens..... | 13 |
| Table 1.3: Ways in which <i>Bildung</i> can shape class discussion | 16 |
| Table 1.4: National percentages for students' reported participation in different civic activities at school..... | 20 |
| Table 2.1 Main studies of citizenship education in school in established democracies since 1999 (by method and year published)..... | 30 |
| Table 2.2 Summary of methods used in the Norwegian case study..... | 42 |
| Table 4.1: Summary of data collection approaches used | 44 |
| Table 4.2: Classes observed by type and number of class..... | 45 |
| Table 4.3: Writing topic by gender for Grade 8 Norwegian class | 46 |
| Table 4.4: Representative comments on the way democracy is practised within the formal curriculum in the <i>ungdomsskole</i> | 57 |

ABSTRACT

How citizenship is taught in schools can have a profound impact on the development of young people's ability and willingness to participate in public life. In turn, citizen participation has significant consequences for the health of a country's democracy (Levine, 2003, Torney-Purta and Richardson, 2004, Osler and Starkey, 2006, Chawla, 2009, Hayward, 2012). Many established democracies today struggle with declining youth voter turnout and civic engagement (Levine, 2003, Catt, 2005, Gallego, 2009, Vowles, 2010, Blais and Rubenson, 2013). However Norway differs from many other democracies in that Norwegian students have one of the highest comparative rates of participation in different civic activities at school (Schulz et al., 2010). To help shed light on why Norway has been so effective at engaging young people in civic life, this thesis examined how democracy is taught in a Norwegian junior high school (*ungdomsskole*). The results of classroom observation, along with interviews with pupils, parents, administrators and teachers, indicate that deeply-held beliefs about the value of democracy underpin teacher practice alongside strong societal and parent support for citizenship education. This in-depth case study highlights the importance of a teaching philosophy based on a Norwegian interpretation of *Bildung*, an approach to education of the individual through discussion and action, so that individuals come to understand how they can contribute as citizens to the wider Norwegian polity. The case study suggests that the values of *Bildung* implicitly inform approaches of participatory learning, deliberation and teachers' relationships with students, in ways which support young people as they in turn learn to value democracy. The research concludes that these experiences help to equip the *ungdomsskole* students observed in this case study with skills that they can use both immediately and in the future to participate as citizens in democratic processes and decision-making.

CHAPTER 1. DEBATES ABOUT TEACHING CITIZENSHIP AND DEMOCRACY IN EDUCATION

1.1 INTRODUCTION

How citizenship is taught in schools can have a profound impact on the development of young people's ability and willingness to participate in public life, and on the health of a country's democracy both now and in the future (Levine, 2003, Torney-Purta and Richardson, 2004, Osler and Starkey, 2006, Chawla, 2009, Hayward, 2012). This thesis reports on a case study of the practices and perspectives of teachers and students on democracy and citizenship in a Norwegian junior high school (*ungdomsskole*) in Trondheim, Mid-Norway. The research aims to explore how young people learn about democracy and skills to equip them for public life in a society that has traditionally highly valued democracy as active citizenship.

This first chapter begins by examining the problems of declining civic engagement confronting many established democracies through a discussion of the wider academic literature. In the opening section, I review the key debates about democratic citizenship and citizenship education in these countries today. The second half of the chapter explores the literature around curriculum and democratic practices within schools. Finally, as a result of this discussion and analysis of the literature, I present my research questions and the structure of the rest of the thesis.

1.2 YOUNG PEOPLE AND PARTICIPATION

A democracy is only as strong as the citizens who participate in it. As Verba and Nie (1972: 1) put it: 'where few take part in decisions there is little democracy; the more participation there is in decisions, the more democracy there is'. This participation is 'activity that has the intent or effect of influencing government action – either directly by affecting the making or implementation of public policy or indirectly by influencing the selection of people' (Verba et al., 1995: 38). Voting has long been regarded as one of, if not the most, significant ways that citizens can participate in democracy (through choosing people or parties in government). Citizen participation in government actions can also involve more direct, active participation including petitions, public referendums, and being involved in local government or engaged in public debate (Barber, 1984, Bohman, 2009). Nevertheless, in representative democracies voter turnout is often regarded as the litmus test for democratic health. There is much debate about the significance of declining voter turnout in established democracies, especially amongst young people, and growing unease that we can no longer take democracy for granted (Delwit, 2013).

To keep our democracies strong it is important that young people experience and learn about political participation (Barber, 1984). Indications that public participation through formal voting is declining amongst those in their late teens and early twenties, particularly in many advanced democracies such as the United States, Canada, New Zealand, and in Western Europe, is concerning (Levine, 2003, Catt, 2005, Gallego, 2009, Vowles, 2010, Blais and Rubenson, 2013). There are a number of theories put forward by researchers as to why young people are losing interest in voting, chief among them two reasons: that as elections have become less competitive (fewer discernible policy differences between the political parties) disinterest grows, and that younger generations have different levels of political interest and attention to their predecessors (Vowles, 2010, Blais and Rubenson, 2013). Disillusionment with the current system in established democracies certainly is a more recent theme following the global financial crisis. The Occupy movement highlighted this new

cynicism (Dahlgren, 2013), along with the popular reaction of youth to Russell Brand's interview with Jeremy Paxman about democracy today on the BBC's Newsnight programme in October 2013 (over nine million hits on YouTube) (Huitson, 2013, Mims, 2013).

However a growing body of new research suggests that despite appearances to the contrary, young people are still interested in politics. While they may choose not to engage through voting (or not yet be old enough to vote), they are aware of political issues and involving themselves in non-traditional methods of participation, debate and action (Norris, 2003, Bell, 2005, Gerodimos and Ward, 2007, Llewellyn and Westheimer, 2009, Wood, 2010, Hayward, 2012). Moreover, new technologies such as smartphones and social media through the internet such as Facebook, Twitter and YouTube are changing the way young people participate and engage (Calenda and Mosca, 2007, Dahlgren, 2013). The experience of Norway is particularly significant in this context because Norwegian students have higher levels of participation than nearly every other country in the West in civic activities at school (Schulz et al., 2010), and as adults, have high levels of volunteerism and membership in social organisations (Wollebæk and Selle, 2003, Views and News staff, 2010).

1.3 DEFINING DEMOCRATIC CITIZENSHIP

This thesis will examine how young people in Norway learn about and come to understand citizenship within a democracy. For the purpose of this research citizenship will be defined first as a legal arrangement, of rights and responsibilities which can be taught in citizenship education in school and which requires developing individual competencies (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013a). These rights and responsibilities can include, for example, voting and accepting laws and public responsibilities such as recognising criminal liability (Bolzan, 2010). The second aspect of citizenship acknowledged in this thesis extends beyond legal rules, and reflects wider social norms and expectations of how citizens participate, and the ways in which they are members of or contribute to society, including in school (Bolzan, 2010).

The idea of citizenship in today's democracies is still a complex and contested one amongst political theorists (Barber, 1984, Kymlicka, 2002, Heywood, 2004), in spite of two thousand years passing since Aristotle debated the concept. In its simplest form, citizenship can be considered as a series of rights and obligations conferred on the individual by the state (Heywood, 2004). However those rights and obligations are not fixed. They vary from state to state and over time as the 'result of social struggle, economic change and shifts in governing ideology' (Faulks, 2006: 123-4). The expansion of the definition into 'social' citizenship rights, (which included education and welfare) stemmed from T.H. Marshall in 1950 (Olssen, 2001). As Heywood (2004: 207) argues, social dimensions of citizenship may include for example, 'the right to live and work in a country...citizens may also be allowed to vote, stand for election and enter certain occupations, notably military or state service, which may not be open to non-citizens'. These wider notions of citizenship are what many established democracies adhere to today.

Yet even social rights are only part of the picture of contemporary citizenship. The notion of a civil society in which more informal norms and networks and obligations of civic engagement are also firmly established within communities, is a model that North America in particular excelled at in the early 1900's, as observed by de Tocqueville (Putnam, 1995). These norms and networks included belonging to voluntary associations of all kinds, for example commercial, industrial or religious,

attendance at public meetings or political rallies, signing petitions, serving on a committee or local organisation, and working for a political party (Putnam, 1995, Vowles, 2004). Some researchers like Putnam argue many of these civic obligations appear to be in decline in established democracies, especially amongst the young. However others question the notion that participation is declining, suggesting that it is merely changing as other new forms of participation are rising to replace them, for example online media blogging, new forms of political protest and consumer activism (Norris, 2011).

The idea of citizenship as participation in a shared collective public life has long been associated with Scandinavian literature and the ideas of social democracy (Mouffe, 2005, Lister et al., 2007). These concepts of citizenship remind us that citizenship is not only understood as a legal framework of rights and duties but also reflects norms and expectations of participation, informing the idea of citizens as members of a community (and a state), who belong to and identify with that community.

Participating in a polity also involves the 'active' side of citizenship, the duties or responsibilities that sit alongside rights (Barber, 1984, Heywood, 2004). Participation is described as one of the 'pillars' of democracy because without the contributions of citizens to the democratic process there would be no democracy (Ainley et al., 2012). This participation is 'activity that has the intent or effect of influencing government action – either directly by affecting the making of implementation of public policy or indirectly by influencing the selection of people who support those policies' (Verba et al., 1995: 38).

Alongside these debates about what constitutes effective citizenship are changing trends in political theory about how citizenship might best be expressed and encouraged in everyday life. Research in many established democracies has shifted away from mainly analysing voting trends and patterns towards understanding the public deliberations and opinion-forming that precede voting (Gutmann and Thompson, 2004, Dryzek, 2005, Bohman, 2009). Bohman (2009: 28) for example describes the importance of ideas of deliberative democracy which are 'first and foremost concerned with the *how* question of democracy: how do the people rule themselves in a democratic manner?' He says that there are two main ways: voting, which relies on electoral representation, and deliberation, in which 'the public deliberation of free and equal citizens is the core of legitimate political decision-making and self-rule' (Bohman, 2009: 28). This deliberative model is largely based on the views of the German philosopher Habermas, and centres on the 'capacity to communicate something to someone, and to respect the rules of discourse in coming to some kind of consensus about these competing articulations' (Todd, 2011: 107). These views on how citizens should take part in deliberation are also philosophically underpinned by the contested perspective of citizens as autonomous beings who communicate best through 'rational' argument (Young, 2001, Biesta, 2002). Understanding this perspective becomes important in the later chapters of this thesis when the discussion turns to teaching young people about participating in public discussion as citizens.

In summary, new trends in citizenship theory suggest that public deliberation has an important role to play in informing and encouraging voting, and public deliberation (and critical, respectful listening) also encourages other forms of political participation and civic engagement both by adults and young people, including subsequent petition signing, community organising or collective problem solving and decision making (Young, 2001, Carpini et al., 2004). The key questions raised by

a number of these deliberative theorists (Mansbridge, 1990, Kymlicka, 2002, Gutmann and Thompson, 2004, Bohman, 2009), relate to how to make these processes happen in real life. How does deliberation become an accessible part of established democracies today? How do citizens have equal opportunities to participate and make their differing views heard (Young, 2001)? And how are agreements reached when there are such differing views (Mouffe, 2009)? Citizenship education may be one of the ways to address these issues.

The globalisation of society, with economic, environmental, and social links and impacts beyond traditional borders, has thrown a curve ball at the traditional views and understandings of citizenship. Citizenship is presently irrevocably tied to the state, with its reciprocal rights and obligations. But in recent years, theorists have increasingly talked about the idea of global citizens, in response to the growing recognition that people may also have wider rights and obligations or opportunities they owe to other citizens on a world level, beyond states (Nussbaum, 1997, Stevenson, 2003, Johnson et al., 2011). Immigration and population mobility is rapidly changing many societies and challenging previously fixed notions of citizenship. Consequently, the 1950s analysis by Marshall which focused on expanding social rights (Olssen, 2001), no longer addresses all the possible aspects and challenges of citizenship. As Stevenson points out, a new question of 'cultural' rights (alongside previously focused on civil, social and political rights), is being asked in the context of 'increasing cultural diversity and globalization' (Stevenson, 2003: 6-7). In this situation, pre-existing norms are challenged as societies become socially and culturally pluralistic, or 'multicultural' (Kymlicka, 2002).

Our understanding of citizenship is also challenged by the new values of individualisation and consumerism linked to neoliberalism, defined here as 'the belief that states ought to abstain from intervening in the economy, and instead leave as much as possible up to individuals participating in free and self-regulating markets' (Thorsen and Lie, 2006: 2). Some argue that these policies directly challenge the collective will required to make political decisions as a demos or political community (Stoker et al., 2011), with the pressure from market-based consumerism overriding political processes. 'Making decisions through markets relies on individuals choosing what suits them. The collective processes that are essential to steer politics and government struggle to deliver against the lionization of individual choice in our societies' (Stoker et al., 2011: 25). But if collective democratic decision-making is reduced, citizens have less to bind them to the final outcome, as they have not made an investment in it through some form of political action (Stoker et al., 2011), be it deliberation or submission-writing or activism.

Neoliberalism is also changing the attitudes of citizens towards politics in other ways. For example, Mouffe (2005) has coined the term 'post-politics' to describe the situation, particularly in European countries, where citizens no longer see a difference between political parties. 'Democracy requires citizens to be given a genuine choice when they go to vote, and this choice must offer a real alternative to the existing order' (2013: 1). This is not possible anymore, Mouffe argues, if the centre-left parties do not offer anything which is a genuine alternative to neo-liberal globalisation. She notes that this lack of difference between parties means there is little real discussion and debate in a democracy of meaningful political differences (2005). Mouffe believes that the skills of engaging in respectful, passionate political conflict (agonism) are desirable because it airs differences in a healthy way, meaning less likelihood of ethnic and other conflicts developing within a state (2005).

Following Mouffe, Todd (2011) also steps into the space of agonism and argues for a view of plurality rather than diversity within democracies, again to address ethnic and cultural political conflicts. Todd believes that multiculturalism is used to 'describe cultures as stable and fixed wholes' (2006: 289). As a result, this perspective limits and ignores the fact that within any culture there can be multiple views and beliefs, what Bauman calls a 'polycultural' society, one that is 'constituted by diversity as opposed to a society merely containing diverse elements' (Bauman, 1999: 199). Todd (2011) believes that learning democratic approaches should not just be about 'dealing' with conflict, through deliberation-style approaches, but also about the role narrative can play in articulating it (hearing and reflecting back one another's stories).

Against these differing views on citizenship and the impacts of societal change, ideas about citizenship education continue to change and evolve. The next section explores current understanding and practice around citizenship education in schools in established democracies.

1.4 CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN SCHOOL: PURPOSE AND PRACTICE

Teaching for citizenship went through something of a revival at the turn of the millennium in many established Westminster democracies, with New Zealand, England and Wales, Canada and Australia all reviewing and making 'active' citizenship a more explicit part of the curriculum (Catt, 2006, Wood, 2012), while the United States and European countries have long had citizenship education programmes with strong emphasis across the curriculum. But a decade on, a number of these countries are again reviewing the way they deliver citizenship education in schools, this time reducing its centrality in the curriculum (Westheimer, 2010). Faulks (2006: 124) points out one of the main reasons for this: 'the ways in which citizenship is defined ideologically by the government of the day will of course affect the form and effectiveness of citizenship education in schools'. The neoliberal leanings of many established states today are having a far-reaching effect on the way in which citizenship education policy is being shaped, from New Zealand to Norway (Hyslop-Margison and Dale, 2010, Aldenmyr et al., 2012, Hayward, 2012, Stray, 2013).

1.5 UNDERSTANDING EDUCATION DEBATES AROUND THE CURRICULUM

Education itself, like definitions of citizenship and democracy, is another contested area. Stevenson observes that people's views on schools, teachers and education are never ideologically neutral, rather, they concern 'the contestation of different positions and interests' (2010: 347). Likewise, when exploring teaching practices around democracy and citizenship, it is important to understand the difference between the prescribed and taught curriculum. A citizenship curriculum is not just a series of instructional statements about what should be taught, but also the 'practices, interactions, values and visions' that shape it (Joseph, 2011: 5). The definition of curriculum as provided by Eisner (1985) is one used by many theorists and educators today for understanding the different roles the curriculum plays. These are:

- Explicit (obviously stated)
- Implicit (not official, often referred to as "hidden")
- Null (non-existing – the curriculum that schools do not teach)

(Joseph, 2011: 5)

To explain these in more detail, the *explicit* curriculum is the framework or publicly stated goals of education (Joseph, 2011). Sometimes also called the *intended* curriculum (McGee, 1997), it also covers the school and class plans of work and intended learning outcomes.

The *implicit*, or 'operational' curriculum is 'the learning and interaction that occurs that is not explicitly announced in school programs' (Joseph, 2011: 5). In other words, it's what happens in the classroom (McGee, 1997). Within the implicit curriculum may also exist the 'hidden' curriculum', which refers to the manner in which schools and classrooms, often unintentionally, 'operate to socialise pupils into ways of thinking about the world, which can often be at odds with what is taught as a part of the learning process' (Hayward, 2010: 61). Classroom practice may not reflect or model the principles espoused by teachers, for example democratic decision making or social justice approaches (Hayward, 2010). This incongruity may also occur at an institutional level (Evans, 2006) where the stated goals and ethos may conflict with expected goals and practices (also see Jackson and Steele, 2004, Scott, 2010).

The *null* or non-existing curriculum is also worth considering. Sometimes, observing what is 'systematically excluded, neglected, or not considered' can give new insights into dominant learning perspectives or philosophies (Joseph, 2011: 5).

Finally, education authors also speak of a *negotiated* curriculum (McGee, 1997). This teaching approach means teachers plan their classroom programmes while taking into account the interests and abilities of their students. Certain aspects of classroom plans have to be non-negotiable, particularly when the curriculum is very prescribed, but beyond that students can contribute their preferences towards shaping the final programme (McGee, 1997). As I discuss later in this chapter, the negotiated curriculum becomes relevant when examining participatory learning approaches to citizenship education.

All of these understandings of the curriculum are important in any study exploring pedagogical practices in order to understand and interpret the data being collected. Against this wider background of curriculum discussion, the argument here turns now to some models of citizenship, to help us understand the kinds of views and values teachers can use to communicate different perspectives of citizenship.

1.6 MODELS OF CITIZENSHIP: WHAT IS CITIZENSHIP EDUCATING FOR?

One key debate in the literature is about what citizenship education is trying to achieve or develop in working with young people – what kind of citizen is ideal? One view of citizenship education is that of Nussbaum (2009), who believes that there are three steps to educating people to become good citizens (Table 1.1).

Nussbaum's model focuses on virtues rather than rights, in a non-institutional way, perhaps addressing a universal ideal of citizenship. As such, the steps involve living an examined life (step 1), by questioning one's beliefs and testing actions and speech for reason and justification (Nussbaum, 1997), recognising that our loyalty is to other humans and the common abilities and problems that link us all together (step 2), and appreciating others' perspectives, which helps us to make reliable

judgements. Nussbaum argues that these three steps offer the individual freedom, and says it is only by taking a risk in allowing people to experience critical and imaginative freedom that democracies are strengthened, as they face an uncertain future (2006).

Table 1.1 Nussbaum's model for educating citizens

| 3 Steps to educating citizens |
|---|
| 1. Develop the capacity for Socratic self-criticism and critical thought about one's own tradition. |
| 2. Help others to see themselves as members of a wider nation and world and know about the diversity of other groups within it as 'knowledge is no guarantee of good behavior, but ignorance is a virtual guarantee of bad behavior'. |
| 3. Develop 'narrative imagination', the ability to put yourself in someone else's shoes, as the saying goes, to build empathy and understanding of what life is like for others. |

Source: Nussbaum (2009: 11)

Another model is drawn from a well-known paper by Westheimer and Kahne (2004). Following a two year study of citizenship education in the United States, they identified three kinds of citizens that teachers most commonly promote. They are the Personally Responsible Citizen (a good, well-behaved person); the Participatory Citizen (an 'involved in doing social good' person); and the Justice-Oriented Citizen (a person who looks at structural change for solutions to social problems) (see Table 1.2).

Table 1.2 Westheimer and Kahne's model for kinds of citizens

| Personally responsible citizen | Participatory citizen | Justice-oriented citizen |
|---|--|--|
| <u>Description</u> Acts responsibly in his/her community Works and pays taxes Obeys laws Recycles, gives blood Volunteers to lend a hand in times of crisis | Active member of community organizations and/or improvement efforts Organizes community efforts to care for those in need, promote economic development, or clean up environment Knows how government agencies work Knows strategies for accomplishing collective tasks | Critically assess social, political, and economic structures to see beyond surface causes Seeks out and addresses areas of injustice Knows about democratic social movements and how to effect systemic change |
| <u>Sample action</u> Contributes food to a food drive | Helps to organize a food drive | Explores why people are hungry and acts to solve root causes |
| <u>Core assumptions</u> To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must have good character; they must be honest, responsible, and law-abiding members of the community. | To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must actively participate and take leadership positions within established systems and community structures. | To solve social problems and improve society, citizens must question, debate, and change established systems and structures that reproduce patterns of injustice over time. |

Source: Westheimer and Kahne (2004: 240)

Westheimer and Kahne observed that teachers tended to give the first type (Personally Responsible) the most attention (an observation drawn from their analysis of democratic theory and program goals and practices). The authors consider this citizen type to be a problematic ideal though, in that the emphasis placed on individual character and behaviour hides the need for collective and public sector initiatives, and that 'volunteerism and kindness are put forward as ways of avoiding politics and policy' (2004: 243). The programmes that explored the participatory and justice-oriented approaches however, were considered to be equally valid in practice and both more likely to develop more active citizens. These two models tended to produce different outcomes though, which left the researchers questioning 'what kind of citizens are the schools trying to shape?' (2004: 263). Schools should think carefully about the political and ideological interests embedded in or easily attached to varied conceptions of citizenship, as they carry different implications for pedagogy, curriculum, evaluation, and educational policy (Westheimer and Kahne, 2004).

Of the two models, Nussbaum's (2009) is more concerned with the process or journey of developing citizens and uses self-reflection, perspectives of others, and narratives to do so. Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) model focuses on the outcomes of teaching about citizenship, and help to show that teachers often direct students towards particular types of citizenship practices. These models give us useful frameworks to reflect on when examining citizenship education practices in a qualitative research study.

1.7 DEMOCRATIC PRACTICE IN SCHOOLS – WHAT DOES IT LOOK LIKE?

Much of the literature around teaching citizenship education focuses on content, such as definitions of citizenship, rather than teaching approaches (Moos, 2003). International studies such as the International Civics and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) (Schulz et al., 2010) highlight the links between classroom activities and building long-term civic commitment and engagement. However as Print (2012: 125) points out, 'the data from these international studies is largely descriptive and not very encouraging in terms of pedagogical methods from teacher-influenced and engaged-learner approaches', and that the results have changed little during the decade from the first international study to the second. This finding suggests that there is an important need for more in-depth qualitative research in this area.

What information is available about formal citizenship education in European education systems however, has noted educational policies that promote 'political literacy, critical thinking, the development of certain attitudes and values and active participation' (Eurydice, 2005: 15) The features that stand out in Norwegian education, compared with other European countries, include a strong association between formal regulations and high levels of participation in student councils, and increased teaching time and focus on citizenship education at the junior high school level in recent years (EACEA, 2012). And of course the association of Norway as a country with being a strongly democratic state (Ringen, 2010) raises the question of whether citizenship education there is a significant contributing factor.

1.8 UNDERSTANDING DEMOCRATIC PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE WITHIN A FORMAL CURRICULUM

In his analysis of pedagogical approaches for building active, informed citizens, Print (2012) divides it into two parts, the formal and the informal curriculum. The formal curriculum covers activities that happen as part of actual subject teaching, based on national curriculum plans or statements, while the informal curriculum ‘incorporates student learning from non-school subject experiences’ (Print, 2012: 119). Given the plethora of understandings and descriptions when trying to classify pedagogy in this area (Mrnjaus, 2012), I have used Print’s framework here to group the main themes of relevance to any qualitative or case analysis of democratic practice in and out of the classroom. But first, the philosophical concept of *Bildung* is explained, along with its role in underpinning democratic practices in European contexts. How *Bildung* philosophy might be applied to classroom teaching is also outlined.

1.8.1 Underpinning philosophy: the European concept of *Bildung*

Within the formal curriculum, any study of European practices of citizenship education needs to identify the educational philosophy underpinning curriculum policy and classroom teaching, in order to make sense of the way the subject is taught. The concept of *Bildung* is one of the key underlying educational philosophies in Europe¹, and particularly still in the Nordic countries (Moos, 2003, Varkøy, 2010). Perhaps the closest brief English translation would be ‘liberal education and cultivation [of the mind]’ (Masschelein and Ricken, 2003: 151), a way to develop individual attitudes and ways of thinking. Another definition of *Bildung* is as a journey of learning throughout life. ‘*Bildung* is about venturing away from oneself into the unknown, stretching one’s own limits in order to properly find one’s true self. In this way, “the journey” becomes a central metaphor for *Bildung*’ (Varkøy, 2010: 88). Because this movement is both individual and collective, dialogue and conversation are necessary parts of the process of development. When a person has become cultured, they are described as someone with a ‘reflective attitude to the form of life which he/she has been given, when the form of life is understood as a collective constellation of working methods, ways of speaking and thinking, communicative patterns, and so on’ (Varkøy, 2010: 95). Having presented the key ideas in the development of the individual through *Bildung*, an explanation of the context of *Bildung* in schools today is required.

Historically, through the twentieth century, *Bildung* was seen both as developing the individual as well as contributing to wider social transformation as people became more well-educated (Masschelein and Ricken, 2003). However the role of *Bildung* in schools as a philosophical approach today is increasingly contested, in spite of still having centrality within a number of European countries’ curricula. One argument against *Bildung* is that this focus on the development of the individual leaves little room for considering other world views, limiting its usefulness in a multicultural (Biesta, 2002), globalised (Masschelein and Ricken, 2003), and post-modern society. However, others believe its holistic approach to the individual as citizen-contributor is being quietly shelved as neoliberal economic concepts of human capital take its place (Stray, 2013). While acknowledging these far-from-resolved differences, the concept of *Bildung* helps us to understand

¹ Originally Germanic, from the 19th century philosopher Hegel. However Hegel’s influences on numerous other influential philosophers and educationalists, such as Dewey, Freire and Kant, are noted (Biesta, 2002, Hyslop-Margison and Dale, 2010, Waddington, 2010).

past and still current European, and particularly Scandinavian, views and values when researching democratic practices in the classroom.

A detailed description of the attitudes to be cultivated through *Bildung* comes from Stojanov (2012). He describes them as having three main aspects: reasons for your own and other's opinions, the ability to transform your beliefs into justifiable concepts, and to discriminate between good and bad reasoning. Stojanov (2012) also shows us the key ways in which the attitudes and abilities of *Bildung* can be cultivated in a classroom setting (see Table 1.3). The first aspect he calls the 'discursive initiation' of weighing up between different claims and their justifications. The second, respect, means acknowledgement of the person as being capable of judgement and choice. The third aspects are self-reflection and self-articulation and are seen as part of the process throughout.

Table 1.3: Ways in which *Bildung* can shape class discussion

| Aspect of teaching practice | Description |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Discursive initiation | Inviting students to be part of the conversation. Weighing up between different claims and their justifications. |
| Respect | Acknowledgement of the students as being capable of judgement and choice. |
| Self-reflection & self-articulation | Pre-requisites of self-development, required throughout the discussion. |

Source: Stojanov (2012).

In the classroom, Stojanov (2012) gives the example of a teacher who is teaching about justice. If the teacher only covers the main theories of justice and asks the students to memorise them for exams, Stojanov argues that the students will not link that knowledge to themselves, and their reasoning will remain superficial and formal. But if the teacher invites the students to think about their experiences of justice and injustice, it will require 'self-reflection and self-articulation as prerequisites of self-development, [which] are necessary components of every process of *Bildung*' (Stojanov, 2012: 86). The English pedagogical philosopher R.S. Peters believed that in the kind of teaching situation described, there would be 'little difference between the teacher and the student. They both experience taking part in mutual challenges and exploring a mutual world' (Varkøy, 2010: 94). All of the areas in the formal curriculum identified later in this section (participatory learning approaches, deliberation and the relationship between students and teachers) have aspects of *Bildung* within them, which become highly relevant in later chapters of this thesis.

In talking about educational leadership, Moos (2003) describes what school leadership looks like if it also follows the principles of *Bildung*. Essentially, he points to a management style that is democratic and inclusive. He says that the role of educational leaders 'must be to create a climate and a community that is supportive of the educational intention. The community should not be governed by hidden structures and discourses of power, but should move towards transparency of relations, democracy and autonomy' (Moos, 2003: 27). Moos makes the important point that if teachers and other staff are to support children in becoming democratic actors then they themselves 'must be subject to transparency, democracy and autonomy: [in essence] *Bildung*. Staff must be treated not as subordinates but as followers' (2003: 27). Again, these observations become useful when conducting research into democratic practices and understandings of citizenship in the school and classroom and what this means in a neoliberal context.

Now, the discussion turns to other specific pedagogical approaches that are of relevance to the development of democratic practice in the formal curriculum.

1.8.2 Participatory learning approaches

The first area that Print (2012) identifies is that of participatory learning approaches such as class voting, group inquiry, simulations, fieldwork and co-operative learning. These are more likely to 'engage learners in experiential learning and aspects of democratic values and practice than other pedagogies' and can enhance student learning and achievement (Print, 2012:118) But Print also notes that research shows that participatory pedagogy in schools is quite weak and characterised by 'textbooks, rote learning and non-participatory, non-critical strategies, as well as inadequate teacher preparation' (2012: 118).

1.8.3 Practising deliberation

Many scholars argue that *discussion and dialogue* need to be part of the pedagogical toolbox (Levine, 2003, Deakin Crick and Wilson, 2005, Hess, 2011, Print, 2012). In a review of research on citizenship education, Deakin Crick & Wilson (2005) summarised that to build student understanding and engagement, facilitating and enabling communication through dialogue and discussion were central to successful citizenship education teaching. When dialogue is a central element students need to be able to substantiate their opinions and often refer to moral values when making value-laden arguments (Schuitema et al., 2011). Schools are particularly suitable sites for discussions of issues. The Civic Mission of Schools report argued that 'when young people have opportunities to discuss current issues in a classroom setting, they tend to have a greater interest in politics, improved critical thinking and communications skills, more civic knowledge, and more interest in discussing public affairs out of school' (Levine, 2003: 6). As Gutmann also notes, 'Schools have a much greater capacity than most parents and voluntary associations for teaching children to reason out loud about disagreements that arise in democratic politics' (Gutmann, 1999: 58). Schools' greater capacity lies in the fact that they contain more ideological diversity than one would expect to find in a family, church, synagogue, mosque or club. This diversity of views makes classrooms powerful places to promote what Gutmann (1999) and Levine (2003) argue are the most important components of democratic education, rational deliberations of competing conceptions of the good life and good society.

When it comes to deliberation in practice, one of the most important findings of the 1991 IEA Civic Education Study was that 'the students' belief that they were encouraged to speak openly in class was a powerful predictor of their knowledge of and support for democratic values, and their participation in political discussion inside and outside school' (Torney-Purta et al., 2001:137). Gearon (2010) similarly argues that in order to teach citizenship properly, students must also critically engage with political concepts, ideals and values and question fundamental concepts like citizenship, democracy and human rights.

Controversial topics have also proved to be particularly effective in encouraging students' learning and longer-term civic engagement (Torney-Purta et al., 2001, Avery, 2002). Topics tend to be 'unresolved questions of public policy that spark significant disagreement' (Hess and Posselt, 2002: 284). Americans dislike contentious disputes about politics, policy issues, and governance (Levine,

2003). However low levels of political engagement in America have linked to declines in political engagement (Hibbing and Theiss-Morse, 2002), while an 'open classroom climate for discussion is a significant predictor of civic knowledge, support for democratic values, participation in political discussion, and political engagement (measured by whether young people say they will vote when they are legally able)' (Hess, 2004: 258).

Storytelling, while not often directly connected with citizenship education, is a teaching approach that is used with success with issues like human rights, racism, and social justice (Bell, 2010, Osler and Zhu, 2011), or with inquiry learning (often used in social studies) (Goodson and Deakin Crick, 2009). Storytelling and oral tradition are also 'democratic [and] freely available to all, requiring neither wealth and status nor formal education' (Bell, 2010:16). Within deliberative theory, narratives and stories are acknowledged as ways of sharing and reflecting on our own and others' differences (Young, 2001, Dryzek, 2004, Todd, 2011). Also known as 'narrative learning', in school this teaching style can provide 'a way of describing and connecting alternative life worlds, of constructing systems of symbols and values, oughts and permissions and power structures' (Goodson and Deakin Crick, 2009:232). The storytelling approach is also a powerful method to engage learners. Students love to hear others' stories and to tell stories about themselves (Goodson and Deakin Crick, 2009, McQueen, 2013). In the words of sociologist C. Wright Mills, this approach helps us to develop our 'sociological imaginations' (1970), to see how 'personal troubles' which affect individuals and their relationships with others can be better understood as 'public issues' linked to societal institutions (Barnes et al., 1999). Storytelling then can be used within citizenship education as a way for students to express themselves and make sense of the world around them.

1.8.4 Relationships between teachers and students

The *relationships* teachers build with their students also further student understanding and engagement (Larsen and Timothy, 2011). There are several critical aspects to consider here, first the importance of creating 'terms of engagement' (hooks, 1989) within the classroom, where 'each person's voice and story can be respectfully heard, [and] stories can be held up and scrutinised in terms of their relationship to systems of power and privilege' (Bell, 2010:21). Ground rules can help teachers to acknowledge student differences in power and privilege and to equalise and encourage shared risk-taking. Secondly, relational teaching also has to do with 'developing what is often called "with-it-ness" ...a significant part of being so tuned into your students that you are "with it", which requires developing a positive rapport with them' (Larsen and Timothy, 2011:81). Aldenmyr et al. (2012: 263) also describe the social climate of the classroom as ideally one that allows for 'closeness, open communication between individuals and the ability to question traditions'. How well teachers set ground rules and use their intuition and experience are significant determinants of the quality of conversations students will have in the classroom.

1.9 UNDERSTANDING DEMOCRATIC PRACTICE WITHIN THE INFORMAL CURRICULUM

In this next section, democratic practices within the informal curriculum are explored. Print (2012: 119) identifies the informal curriculum as 'student learning from non-school subject experiences'. He says it tends to comprise two sets of related activities. The first he calls 'instrumental activities', which covers such things as student governance, newspapers, debating, student elections, fundraising and political clubs. These activities, according to the literature, are positively correlated with civic engagement later in life (Verba et al., 1995, McFarland and Thomas, 2006). The second

group Print calls 'expressive activities' such as sports, clubs, bands and social activities. These are perceived as contributing less to building civic engagement, although still acceptable forms of participation. Print (2012) also acknowledges the role of volunteerism and service learning (sometimes called community service), however in Norway service learning is not part of the curriculum at all, and volunteerism tends to be an extra-curricular activity and carried out more by adults².

In looking at participation in school in informal activities, there are some research findings of relevance to this thesis. The 2009 ICCS study on civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower-secondary students in 38 countries, showed that '76 percent of ICCS students, on average, reported having voted in school elections and 61 percent reported voluntary participation in music or drama activities. About 40 percent of students said that they had been actively involved in debates, taken part in decision-making about how their school was run, taken part in school assembly discussions, or been candidates for class representative or the school parliament' (Schulz et al., 2010: 135).

Norway was the country that excelled in this area of the study. In all categories except one, these being: active participation in a debate; voting for class representative or school parliament; taking part in decision-making about how the school is run; taking part in discussions at a school assembly; and becoming a candidate for class representative or school parliament; students participate at more than 10 percentage points above the ICCS average, and rank as the 3rd highest country in most areas (see Table 1.4). Only voluntary participation in school-based music or drama activities outside of regular lessons is at the ICCS average.

² However there is a high level of volunteerism amongst Norwegian 16-79 year olds, in 2010 the third highest participation rate in the world (Views and News staff, 2010).

Table 1.4: National percentages for students' reported participation in different civic activities at school

| | Civic activities | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Voluntary participation in school-based music or drama activities outside of regular lessons | Active participation in a debate | Voting for class representative or school parliament | Taking part in decision-making about how the school is run | Taking part in discussions at a student assembly | Becoming a candidate for class representative or school parliament |
| Norway | 61 | 62 | 90 | 58 | 52 | 62 |
| ICCS average | 61 | 44 | 76 | 40 | 43 | 42 |
| Norwegian ranking [^] | average | 3rd | 3rd= | 3rd | 8th | 3rd |

[^] Ranking is out of 36 of the 38 countries who participated in the survey (two countries did not meet sampling requirements).

Source: Schulz et al. (2010: 138-139)

While these are fairly simplistic measures of developing citizenship skills within the school, they highlight the kinds of practices occurring there, and they also predict future participation in society. Ainley et al., analysing the European countries only, found that for many students, their experience with participation in the community, 'proved to be a strong positive predictor of expected active political participation' (2012, p 18-19). But in only six countries, one of which was Norway, were there positive influences on expected active political participation based on students' participation at school. As an exception it is worth exploring what they are doing in order to see why levels of participation are so high, and in areas that are likely to encourage young people into active citizenship in future years.

School councils and other school committees as a form of citizenship education receive little acknowledgement in the literature on citizenship education. However they are used to varying degrees across countries and different types of schools, perhaps why they are limited in their effectiveness, as a study in the United States found (McFarland and Starmanns, 2009). In Australia, the YES project found that while students appreciate these activities, they do not value them highly, largely because the school appeared not to value them. Students 'perceived they had little influence over important decisions, their opinions were not valued and student government had no or negligible power, unlike in the case in Scandinavian countries' (Print, 2012). School councils and other school committees are worth considering here as another practice that contributes to the development of students' democratic skills and knowledge.

1.10 SHAPING THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The review of literature about teaching citizenship presented here has raised a number of questions about the ways in which democracy is practised in schools and how citizenship education can be taught most effectively. As a result, three high-level questions formed the basis of the study that is reported here, investigating how citizenship is taught in Norway through a qualitative, exploratory case study of a Norwegian junior high school (*ungdomsskole*). More explanation of how this case was selected is found in Chapter 3, on the pros and cons of a qualitative case study approach.

The following research questions then guide this study:

1. How is democracy and citizenship understood in the Norwegian curriculum?
2. How is citizenship and democracy practised in an exemplar junior high or *ungdomsskole*?
3. What can other established democracies learn from the Norwegian case study example?

1.11 CONCLUSION AND THESIS STRUCTURE

In this chapter I have outlined why the participation of young people is important for the health of a democratic state. I have also explored current debates on and understandings of citizenship. I have outlined the purpose of citizenship education and the role of the formal and informal curricula in developing young people as active citizens.

Here I introduce the five remaining chapters of the thesis. Chapter 2: 'Democracy and citizenship education in Norway', explains why I came to focus on Norway in my case study, and to review the literature and history of Norway as a democracy, in terms of education and in particular citizenship education. In Chapter 3: 'Research Methods' explores ways in which other researchers have carried out studies on citizenship and democratic learning in schools, and ways of carrying out case studies. Chapter 4: 'The case study' presents the findings and analysis of the research, addressing each of the three main research questions. In Chapter 5: 'Discussion', I compare the case study findings to the wider literature and debates, and offer some recommendations and final conclusions.

CHAPTER 2. DEMOCRACY AND CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN NORWAY

2.1 INTRODUCTION: WHY NORWAY?

As noted towards the end of Chapter 1, Norwegian students have higher levels of participation than nearly every other country in the West when it comes to participating in classroom debates, being a representative on the student council, or participating in decisions about how their school is run (Ainley et al., 2012). Yet there is little research that explores how Norwegian students learn about democracy and citizenship and why levels of democratic participation are so high. As a result, this case study explores teacher and student perspectives and practices for learning about democracy in a lower secondary school in Trondheim, a city in Mid-Norway.

Before discussing the case methodology and detail however, this chapter gives some background information about the Norwegian political and educational systems, to give context to the case study. First, Norway's social democratic history is outlined, to demonstrate how strongly democratic and egalitarian values have shaped education policy in the past, along with information about levels of civic engagement among young Norwegians today. Then a description of the education framework is given, along with more detail about how citizenship education is delivered in schools currently, along with an overview of recent Norwegian research in this area.

2.2 NORWAY THE DEMOCRACY

Norway, as one of the Nordic countries (including Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Iceland) has been described as a society with 'striking egalitarianism, a strong public sector, and a culture of cooperative institutions which merges private with public interests' (Østerud, 2005: 705). Just over five million people live in Norway, spread over a country slightly bigger than New Zealand (Statistics Norway, 2013). In 2012 Norway was also the fourth richest country in the world in terms of GDP per capita (Global Finance, 2013). The economy is based largely on oil. State-ownership of these oil companies and a focus on saving the profits to keep inflation down means the country has been credited with supporting the largest national pension fund in the world (SWF, 2014). Yet this strong social contract, characterised by high levels of institutional centralisation and balanced by high levels of citizen control, was established before the oil discoveries of the 1970s (Tranvik and Selle, 2007).

Norway has had a long tradition of democracy, often supported by education, since its Constitution was written in 1814. At that time the country had just been transferred to Sweden by Denmark (Østerud, 2005). Nearly a century later, in 1905 Norway seceded from the Swedes in a peaceful process as Norway's Parliament (the *Storting*), established in the 1880s, called for democratic reform and secession at the same time (Østerud and Selle, 2006). Lay religious movements of the time were also forms of popular resistance (Moller and Skedsmo, 2013). Teachers were central to these movements, as they had the cultural and social capital to take on a variety of roles within the community and to mobilise others to stand up for their beliefs and contribute to both economic and educational development. (Telhaug et al., 2004, Moller and Skedsmo, 2013).

The Norwegian Labour Party emerged as the 'hegemonic force' from World War II until the 1960s, from which time minority governments were common, either the Labour Party alone or with a minority coalition of non-socialist parties (Østerud and Selle, 2006: 27). However the Norwegian political system in the 1980s did not escape the neoliberal reforms of many other countries, though

not taken to the extremes seen in countries like the UK and New Zealand (Østerud, 2005). A comprehensive social science research project conducted by the Norwegian government in the 1990s, the Norwegian Study of Power and Democracy, analysed how well the country's democracy functions and the effects of such reforms. It found that the Norwegian democratic system was still functioning rather well as a 'small polity with responsive and accommodating elites, a decent level of trust in government, relatively low levels of outright corruption and crime, and a fairly resourceful population with a high level of education and channels for voice in local government, organisations, schools and the workplace' (Østerud and Selle, 2006: 43).

Even so, the report observed that there was less power in Parliament as well as in local government and civil society organisations. It argued that in the preceding years, parliamentary democracy had been weakened from the electorate to the executive, while local government was shrinking due to the standardisation of welfare services (Østerud and Selle, 2006). Other contributors to the decline have been posited by Ringen (2010) as the power of economic globalisation to destabilise economies, and ceding sovereignty to supra-national bodies. These arguments are significant for this thesis because of the way these wider policy changes affect understandings of citizenship and also how changing educational ideology impacts upon how citizenship education is perceived and valued (Østerud and Selle, 2006: 44).

On the positive side, Ringen notes several factors that continue to boost democracy in Norway. First, that 'the strength of the Norwegian system is less in lofty democratic idealism than in its down-to-earth solidity in the making of public policy' (Ringen, 2010: 50), and that 'careful, deliberate, consensual, and slow decision-making' has served the country well. Second, that democratic culture within Norway is of 'pervasive importance' (Ringen, 2010: 49). Other research has observed that in spite of declining electoral turnout, broader political engagement within the country such as political interest, political discussions and political action, has increased (Listhaug and Grønflaten, 2007).

2.3 UNDERSTANDING EDUCATIONAL POLICY TENSIONS IN NORWAY

Norway, like Denmark and Sweden, has in the past few decades undergone a back-and-forth series of educational policy shifts of centralisation/decentralisation with successive governments and outside pressures determining the nature of the changes (Telhaug et al., 2004, Wiborg, 2012, Stray, 2013). Examining these shifts is necessary to understand what has shaped Norway's educational direction up to this point, particularly in relation to teaching about democracy, and its implications for the future of citizenship education there. This next section outlines some of these key tensions to 'set the scene' for the case study that follows, and to be able to discuss the findings from the case study in light of these differing views.

Norway's education system has long been predicated on democracy. But there are different interpretations of the primary purpose of this democratic education, whether it has been for individual advancement or nation-building. One argument is that 'democracy and citizenship have traditionally been important concepts, emphasized in *Bildung*, together with knowledge, as the ultimate goal for Norwegian education' (Stray, 2013: 165). *Bildung*, as discussed in Chapter 1, is the idea that personal transformation is achieved through education, and was drawn from the German educational philosopher Hegel (Stojanov, 2012). However this emphasis on individual goals is contrasted with the argument that from World War II the core purpose of schooling in Norway has

been about nation-building through creating a strong and equal social community, developing 'a sense of belonging and of respect and mutual understanding between students from different social classes' (Telhaug et al., 2004: 143). The differences are not mutually exclusive though. These comments reflect the ongoing tension of policy in Norwegian education over the past fifty years, that has swung between teacher autonomy and expertise along with *Bildung* philosophy, and centralised government dictation of direction and values and centrally-approved textbooks (Telhaug et al., 2004, Johansson et al., 2013). Future tensions are likely as government policy continues to evolve and change, and as social democracy is increasingly challenged by neoliberalism and conservatism (Moos, 2013). Still others worry that *Bildung* itself risks commodification under contemporary conditions of postmodernity, asking whether the 'edifying cultural potential' of *Bildung* can continue to be realised, given that culture itself has been thoroughly commercialized (Pinar, 2011: 74).

These tensions have also lead to an interesting position for principals of schools that are still overwhelmingly government-led rather than parent-led (Wiborg, 2012), albeit in an indirect fashion, through benchmarking, guidelines and skill development (Moos, 2013). Moos even goes so far as to call principals *mediators*, meaning that they must translate the expectations of external stakeholders (government, municipality, parents, etc.) into a 'language and a practice that are acceptable and legitimate to the teachers and other staff' (Moos, 2013: 218). While Norwegian school leaders are 'accountable for promoting the values that form the base for a democratic society' (Norberg and Johansson, 2010: 332), they tend to take the role of mobilising staff, rather than the 'command' approach more often seen in the USA and UK (Moos, 2013: 218). There is a strong and ongoing tug-of-war between government policy and teacher autonomy, with principals caught in a difficult balancing act.

Outside influences have also had a marked effect on the Norwegian curriculum. In 2001, poor results in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) in reading, mathematics and science, (poor that is, relative to its Baltic neighbours and others in the OECD), led to a national debate and the reframing of the Core Curriculum in 2006, known as the Knowledge Promotion Reform (*Kunnskapsløftet*) (Stray, 2013). The OECD report on Norwegian education described the national view, explaining that 'while Norway's results [in PISA]...are at or above the OECD average depending on the subject, these outcomes are not considered satisfactory given Norway's high levels of spending on education' (OECD, 2011: 13). But where Norway may not have had its strengths in reading, writing and arithmetic, it certainly has long been a bastion of democracy (Ringén, 2010). As the latest international study on civics and citizenship showed, the country performed well, with Norwegian 9th grade students' knowledge and skills putting them in 5th place amongst their peers in the 38 country study (Schulz et al., 2010). Key findings were that:

- Norwegian students expressed strong support for women's rights and had high confidence in democratic institutions, although with slightly lower support for immigrants' rights.
- Compared with other Nordic countries Norwegian students had higher scores on most measures of commitment to society and politics.
- They also had significantly higher scores than the average for all 38 ICCS countries in terms of participation in school boards and agencies for participation and discussion, and their intention to vote in political elections as adults.

- Norwegian pupils feel they can speak freely and disagree with their teachers when discussing social issues in the classroom. They also feel that they are being encouraged by their teachers to form opinions and express them. Norwegian and Nordic students experience this climate in the classroom as more open than the international average.
- One in four Norwegian students had been candidates for the class and/or student council in the last 12 months.
- They also scored high on a scale of democratic participation in the school community.
- A very high proportion of Norwegian students experience fair, interested and receptive teachers.
- Parental interest in politics and social issues has a strong effect on students' interest and likely future participation.

(Fjeldstad et al., 2009: 36).

The ICCS study also found that when asking teachers and principals about goals for citizenship, across all the countries they emphasised 'knowledge' as the most important goal, while 'critical thinking' was rated as the second most important (Schulz et al., 2010: 184). Solhaug (2013: 189) notes however, that 'in the Nordic countries, critical thinking was regarded as the most important goal'. He comments that the findings suggest that these teachers seem to value student participation and forming of opinions in school rather than being 'passive recipients of factual knowledge' (Solhaug, 2013: 189).

2.4 LEVELS OF CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AMONG YOUNG NORWEGIANS

Changes to representative democracy in Norway have also impacted on levels of civic engagement among young people, like many other established democracies. Compared to older adults, 'youths vote less often and involve themselves less often in civil society' with about half of first-time eligible voters participating in the 2005 general election (Lauglo and Øia, 2007: 10). Today's Norwegian young people also join voluntary organizations less frequently than their predecessors some decades ago. However even membership with minimal involvement can still lead to higher levels of civic engagement (measured by levels of social trust, voting behaviour and newspaper reading), as demonstrated by Wollebæk and Selle (2003) in their Norwegian study of participation in voluntary organisations. In contrast to Putnam's (1995) theory of social capital (also based on the same measures of civic engagement), the authors found that while those affiliated to an organisation display higher levels of social capital than outsiders, the difference between active and passive members is absent or negligible (Wollebæk and Selle, 2003). In other words, membership matters more than whether you do anything as a result of it.

Hellevik (1996) used data from repeated public opinion surveys to compare people's basic life goals and views of means appropriate for reaching these goals, among youths and older adults in different generations. He found that young people tended to have a shorter time perspective on health, environment and consumption than older adults (Lauglo and Øia, 2007: 10). The analysis of values and value change among youths in these Nordic studies indicates that 'there may be a rising challenge for civil society and schools alike: how to stimulate participation in civic activities which require sustained commitment to act and invest time and effort' (Lauglo and Øia, 2007: 10).

Alongside the challenge of maintaining traditional levels of participation, is addressing the citizenship problems posed by increasing numbers of migrants from many countries.

2.5 THE CHALLENGES OF IMMIGRATION AND MULTICULTURALISM – EDUCATION IMPLICATIONS

Critics of the 'nation-building' approach undertaken by the Norwegian state through the mid-twentieth century argue that this emphasis doesn't allow room for other ethnicities, namely minority groups in society. The idea of 'school as social community' developing a sense of belonging, respect and mutual understanding between students from different social classes did not work so well when it came to cultural differences (Telhaug et al., 2004: 143). Eventually in the 1970s a better balance was reached between the 'monocultural community of the social democratic project and acceptance and encouragement of ethnic and regional identities' (Telhaug et al., 2004: 148), meaning the recognition of the Sami (indigenous) culture, among others. However, Norway today still struggles with tensions between the majority population and these minorities (Solhaug, 2013).

The other trend of note is the increasing number of immigrants to Norway in recent decades (Solhaug, 2013), who settle in dispersed patterns across the country. The influx of new minorities has led to discourse on civil life and whether to follow practices of assimilation, integration, or accommodation. Migrants now comprise up to 10% of the population, with half coming from Asia, Africa and Latin America, while the remaining half are from Western countries (OECD, 2010, Solhaug, 2012). However, non-Western immigrants tend to be seen as the new lower class, which is a 'challenge to social and political stability' (Østerud, 2005: 12). Furthermore, research on how immigrants keep and maintain their cultural heritage suggests that Norwegians aren't that interested in becoming more culturally diverse but prefer homogeneity (Aalberg et al., 2012, Solhaug, 2012), although young people are more tolerant of cultural diversity (Lauglo and Øia, 2007).

All of these aspects leave schools and teachers with a number of educational dilemmas when the interests of the majority and that of the minorities are to be balanced in teaching and learning, particularly about democracy and participation (Norberg and Johansson, 2010, Solhaug, 2013). The 2010 OECD report on migrant education in Norway summed up the problems in this area well, noting that teachers were not well prepared to deal with these changes:

Schools are challenged by the growing heterogeneity of the student population and increased demands to meet the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students. The government has recognised the need to further enhance the multicultural perspective in teaching practice and school management. However, teachers are not yet well prepared to adapt their teaching to the specific needs of immigrant students...

(OECD, 2010: 8).

Solhaug (2012) agrees and points out that the political cost long term for immigrants is that it is much more difficult for them to participate politically than for ethnic Norwegians. He argues that 'this political inequality most likely also transfers into or reinforces immigrants' subordinate social position and reinforces [their] economic and social inequality in Norwegian society' (Solhaug, 2012: 15). His point posits the question of how citizenship education and democratic practices in Norwegian schools are currently dealing with these challenges.

2.6 CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN NORWEGIAN SCHOOLS: CONTEMPORARY DEBATE

At the policy level, Norway subscribes to the European Union model known as Education for Democratic Citizenship (EDC). There are three aspects to EDC: **About** (knowledge); **For** (the achievement of values, understanding, skills and attitudes); and **Through** (participation and practical learning). However the national pride in citizenship education has been tested by concern about poor results for learning in reading, science and maths, as measured through the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), now called 'Pisa shock' by some commentators (Sellar and Lingard, 2013). The resulting national educational reforms in 2006, (*Kunnskapsløftet* - The Knowledge Promotion), were seen by some academics as strongly neoliberal (Wiborg, 2012, Stray, 2013). Stray for example describes international education policy (such as EDC) as legitimising education and the activity of educational institutions by arguing that the school is an arena for democratic practice and preparation for citizenship. In contrast, the Norwegian policy papers used financial arguments for reforming the educational system. 'The concept of social capital is not emphasised in the [Norwegian] national documents. Instead, the concept of human capital is given a priority role and becomes the main ambition for education' (Stray, 2010: 17).

2.7 DEMOCRATIC PRACTICE WITHIN THE NORWEGIAN SCHOOL

In terms of implementation, in the lower secondary school there are several curriculum areas that address the ideas of citizenship and democracy. The Social Studies curriculum (where most citizenship education is based) has recently been revised and the new one will be rolled out in the 2013/14 year (from August 2013) (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2011). It is composed of 3 subjects: social science, history and geography. It is third largest in the curriculum with around 1.7 hours per week. Human Rights Education (HRE) is also included in the Curriculum for Social Studies (grades 1-11) and the Curriculum for Christianity, Religion, and Ethics (grades 1-10).

All pupils in 8-10th grades (13-15 years) have also since 2007 taken a compulsory subject translated as 'pupil council work' (*elevrådsarbeid*) comprising 71 hours over a three year period (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2011). This hour per week was like a class meeting where students discuss problems they want their class representatives to bring to the student council. As such, this subject was very much focused on developing the skills of young people as future active citizens, 'through activities in pupil groups and participation in influence and decision-making processes, including work in the pupil council' (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2011). However a survey carried out in 2010 by the Directorate of Education and Training to identify the challenges and issues faced by schools in implementing it resulted in a final report on school practices and a change in the approach chosen to teach citizenship (EACEA, 2012). In the 2013-14 year, fourteen elective subjects can be offered instead, one of which is called 'democracy in action'. Schools have to offer a minimum of two electives. Students do not necessarily choose which electives they take, instead the school decides how these are allocated (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013c). This change will potentially weaken democratic experiences and practices within Norwegian schools.

Legislating for democratic practice in school is one of the main ways that Norway has established high levels of youth participation. The areas legislated for include an annual student survey, at school level, student councils, and students' rights to self-assessment and to participate in their development. These areas are outlined in further detail below.

The student survey (*elevundersøkelsen*) is an important part of the Norwegian way of encouraging student participation in their school. The nationally administered survey covers set questions for students in a range of areas: social welfare, satisfaction with teachers, coping, academic challenge, student democracy, physical learning, bullying at school, motivations, academic guidance, decision-making and careers (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013b). The survey is mandatory, once a year at grade 7, 10 and the first year of upper-secondary school (although schools can survey all students from the 5th grade onwards) (Trondheim Kommune, 2013). The results are collated nationally and made available to schools (both their own findings and comparisons with others) – and to the public, down to individual school level. Newspapers publish the results every year. Schools can also choose to have parent and teacher surveys to triangulate the findings. Principals, teachers, student council members and union leaders (and sometimes local council staff who oversee education in the region) are expected to sit down together and discuss the findings and work out what needs to improve and in what ways as a result.

The student survey has two questions on democracy (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013b). The first question is about how well the student council works, with a rating from ‘very good’ to ‘very bad’, and the second is about whether the school acts on student suggestions, rated from ‘very often or always’ to ‘never’. There are also questions on decision-making. These give the students’ views on how much they have a say in class by participating in determining objectives, work plans, work methods, and what should be emphasised in the final evaluation (Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2013b).

The student council (*elevrådet*) is a compulsory structure in Grades 5-10. Each class votes student representatives onto the student council. It is intended to ‘promote the interests of the pupils in the school and work to create a good learning and school environment. The Council should also express its views and make recommendations on matters relating to the community of students’ (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 1998: § 11-2). Education Law also states that there should be a student environment committee, where ‘where students, parents and staff are given the right and opportunity to influence environmental education at each school’ (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 1998: § 11-1a).

Students also have the right to self-assessment as part of continuous assessment in their subjects. Students are expected to actively participate in assessing their own work, competence and professional development (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 1998: § 3-12). This policy is effectively the idea of a *negotiated* curriculum as discussed by McGee (1997).

In summary, historical education policy around citizenship and democracy in Norway has aimed to develop students’ understanding of democracy and their ability to participate as active citizens. The tensions that exist are around whether these wider societal attributes are being eroded by more recent education policy shifts within Norway that focus on students who achieve better scores on international tests in reading, maths and science, and as future workers who will keep the economy going. If that is the case, citizenship education in its current form may not be strong enough to withstand this erosion of democratic values on its own, or to address the problems raised by increased multiculturalism and globalisation.

2.8 RESEARCH QUESTIONS REVISITED

The research questions identified in Chapter 1 now require further detail, in light of increased understandings of the Norwegian practice of citizenship education in lower secondary school. These questions include (new ones in italics):

1. How is democracy and citizenship understood in the Norwegian curriculum?
 - *How much do societal/parental views and values uphold school learning about democracy and citizenship?*
2. How is citizenship and democracy practised in an *ungdomsskole* in the formal curriculum?
3. How is citizenship and democracy practised in an *ungdomsskole* in the informal curriculum?
4. What can other established democracies learn from the Norwegian case study example?

2.9 CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the picture of education policy in Norway, particularly as it relates to teaching democracy and citizenship, is somewhat complex and contested. Tensions between central government and teacher autonomy, large numbers of immigrants in the past decade, and shifts in ideology have all contributed to the complexity. Yet in spite of all of these things, democratic participation is, for now, still central to the curriculum through legislation and valued and practised by many young Norwegian students today. All of these findings led to the revisiting of the original research questions outlined in Chapter 1, with further sub-questions being added to draw a deeper understanding of the ways in which Norwegian teachers and students view learning about democracy in a junior high school.

The next chapter discusses research methods used for researching citizenship education, and the pros and cons of a qualitative case study. Other aspects of research are also considered, including culture, sampling, validity and reliability, ethics. Various data collection methods and analysis are also covered.

CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH METHODS

3.1 INTRODUCTION

The objective of this chapter is to outline the methods best suited to researching citizenship education in schools, as a single researcher in a different cultural context. First, I consider the methodologies used in most of the main studies carried out in the past fifteen years in the literature on citizenship education in schools in established democracies. Second, I justify the suitability of a qualitative case study approach for my research. Here I will briefly outline the key features of qualitative research and explain why qualitative methods and a case study are the best way forward for addressing my research questions. I then consider the areas of sampling strategies, research validity, and ethics requirements when carrying out a research project of this nature. Next, data collection methods are covered: interviews, class observations and documentation. Finally, some comments on analysis, and a summary table documenting the case study method, complete the chapter.

3.2 METHODS USED FOR RESEARCHING CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS

The purpose and effectiveness of citizenship education has come under increased focus within academia and education in recent years, as noted in Chapter 1. As a result, there have also been an increasing number of research studies on how it is taught in schools. Table 3.1 below provides a summary of most of the main studies of citizenship education carried out in schools in established democracies (looking at teacher and student perspectives and practices) since 1999, describing the focus of each study and the methods used by the researcher(s). As indicated by the table, qualitative methods are the most common approach to the study of citizenship education in schools. However, the few quantitative studies done have been large-scale. Of the 17 studies summarised, 4 rely on quantitative methods, 9 on qualitative methods and 4 on a mixed-methods approach.

Table 3.1 Main studies of citizenship education in school in established democracies since 1999 (by method and year published)

| Methodology | Authors | Year | Focus of study | Description of Methods Used | Study size |
|--------------|------------------------------|------|---|---|--|
| Quantitative | Kerr, Ireland, Lopes & Craig | 2003 | Citizenship Education Longitudinal survey in England aims to identify, measure and evaluate the extent to which 'effective practice' in citizenship education develops in schools | Longitudinal surveys of students, teachers and school leaders | 112 schools, 18,500 students starting in Year 7, 84 school leaders, 387 teachers |
| Quantitative | Kahne & Sporte | 2008 | The impact of civic learning opportunities on students' commitment to civic participation | Longitudinal surveys | 4,057 students in 52 schools |

| Methodology | Authors | Year | Focus of study | Description of Methods Used | Study size |
|--------------|--|------|---|---|---|
| Quantitative | Schultz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr & Losito | 2010 | ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower-secondary school students in 38 countries | Cognitive tests and surveys | Over 140,000 Grade 8 students in 5,300 schools from 38 countries, with additional data from 62,000 teachers |
| Quantitative | Flanagan | 2013 | Political theories of teenage citizens | Longitudinal surveys | 500-1000 adolescents (aged 12-19) in each of six countries |
| Qualitative | Apple & Beane | 1999 | Democratic schools: Lessons from the chalkface. Four schools that have successfully put in place democratic and critical educational practices as guides to their entire curriculum | Case studies | 4 schools in the US |
| Qualitative | Mutch | 2003 | Citizenship Education in New Zealand: Inside or Outside the Curriculum? | Case study | 1 primary school in New Zealand |
| Qualitative | Taylor, Smith & Gollop | 2008 | New Zealand children and young peoples' perspectives on citizenship | Focus group discussions and imaginary country exercise | 66 children and young people (aged 8/9 and 14/15 years) |
| Qualitative | Børhaug | 2008 | Educating voters: political education in Norwegian upper-secondary schools | Interviews and class observations | 16 upper-secondary school teachers, 4 with classroom observation |
| Qualitative | Sim | 2010 | Teacher agency and citizenship education in Singapore | Case study, semi-structured interviews, classroom observations and documentary study. | 8 teachers, 43 interviews, 84 lesson observations |
| Qualitative | Wood | 2010 | Everyday citizenship perspectives from young people in New Zealand | Focus groups and poster activity | Four high schools, 122 students |

| Methodology | Authors | Year | Focus of study | Description of Methods Used | Study size |
|---------------|--|------|---|---|--|
| Qualitative | Osler | 2011 | Teacher interpretations of citizenship education: national identity, cosmopolitan ideals, and political realities | Interviews | 8 teachers across 3 contrasting high schools (students aged 11-18) |
| Qualitative | Faden | 2012 | Canadian and US teachers' perspectives on the 'good' citizen | Comparative case study, interviews | 13 high school history teachers, 6 in Ontario, 7 in Maryland |
| Qualitative | Thornberg & Elvstrand | 2012 | Children's experiences of democracy, participation, and trust in school in Sweden | Class observations, informal conversations and teacher interviews | 8 classes, 180 students, 26 teachers across 3 schools |
| Mixed methods | Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schultz | 2001 | Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen (CIVED) | First phase used case studies with interviews, policy and textbook analysis Second phase surveys | 28 countries, 90,000 students |
| Mixed methods | Westheimer & Kahne | 2004 | Models of the different kinds of citizens students are encouraged to become in American high schools | Pre- and post-survey data, observations and interviews, school documents | 10 schools |
| Mixed methods | Hess & Posselt | 2002 | How American high school students experience and learn from the discussion of controversial public issues | Pre- and post-course surveys, classroom observation, interviews with students and teachers, videotapes of discussions, classroom materials and student work | 2 classes, 53 class periods, 12 focus students |
| Mixed methods | Evans | 2006 | Educating for citizenship: what teachers say and what teachers do in England and Canada | Surveys, interviews, observations, class material | 33 specialist secondary teachers |

There are three different kinds of data collection approaches, as shown in the table above (Table 3.1), quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods. Quantitative studies tend to be much larger in size (numbers of people involved), and collect numerical data in order to have statistical validity. In the field of citizenship education, these studies are also often longitudinal (conducted as a series over time) to measure changes in things such as beliefs and political activity (as shown by Kerr et al., 2004, Kahne and Sporte, 2008, Flanagan, 2013). The very large international studies on citizenship education CIVED (mixed method) (Torney-Purta et al., 2001) and ICCS (quantitative) (Schulz et al., 2010) stand alone but there is a certain amount of data (survey questions of students and teachers) that is comparable between them at present. Future surveys are intended to be much more aligned, which will make comparing these datasets much easier, however if there is little change in the data over time (Print, 2012) qualitative studies may help to provide further useful information.

Qualitative studies tend to be much smaller, with fewer participants, and don't rely on numerical measurement (King et al., 1994). Within citizenship education research, these kinds of approaches also usually collect different data, such as class observations and interviews rather than surveys (see for example Mutch, 2003, Børhaug, 2008, Thornberg and Elvstrand, 2012). Case studies are a useful approach to understanding motivations, and reported experiences in a teaching environment. Moreover here because they gather a range of data across one or more educational settings (Bassey, 1999). One insightful and detailed qualitative research project in this area is the work by Sim (2010), on teacher agency and citizenship education in Singapore, with a case study that covered eight teachers, 43 interviews and 84 lessons, which she used to develop four models of teaching styles.

Mixed method approaches often analyse some quantitative data, and then carry out further qualitative data collection and analysis. Sometimes in this approach, the quantitative data used is from a large dataset that the researcher has accessed, known as secondary analysis (because they have not collected the data themselves). Secondary analyses from quantitative studies can be used to the benefit of qualitative researchers, who can draw on findings from larger projects to establish research questions for small-scale studies that can 'drill down' to explore the thoughts and perspectives of participants, without entailing the cost of a larger project. Many secondary analyses have been carried out on the CIVED and ICCS datasets³.

3.3 PROS AND CONS OF A QUALITATIVE CASE STUDY APPROACH

Quantitative studies have the advantage of being able to carry out statistically validated research, and to compare different groups or cross-sections, and to account for potentially confounding factors. But as Table 2.1 shows, most of these are studies with thousands of participants, and often across several countries, meaning that they can be expensive to administer both in terms of cost and labour involved.

However the number of qualitative studies carried out by respected researchers in this field (such as Hess and Posselt, 2002, Apple and Beane, 2007, Osler and Zhu, 2011), suggests that this is an equally

³ I have not included the secondary analyses of these datasets in the table as they are too numerous to list, and also rely on the base dataset (CIVED/ICCS) included in Table 2.1.

valid way to collect data and contribute to further understandings and practice. Gillham (2000: 11) outlines six things that a qualitative approach allows you to do:

1. To carry out an investigation where other methods – such as experiments – are either not practicable or not ethically justifiable.
2. To investigate situations where little is known about what is there or what is going on. More formal research *may* come later.
3. To explore complexities that are beyond the scope of more ‘controlled’ approaches.
4. To ‘get under the skin’ of a group or organization to find out what really happens – the informal reality which can only be perceived from the inside.
5. To view the case from the inside out: to see it from the perspective of those involved.
6. To carry out research into the *processes* leading to results rather than into the ‘significance’ of the results themselves.

The purpose of the research (and cost, time and accessibility) shapes the choice of approach used.

In this research project, all of Gillham’s six points fit well with my research questions, in terms of wanting to explore Norwegian school practices around democracy and citizenship. While I could gain some understanding of the Norwegian curriculum through reading curriculum documents (the explicit/intended curriculum), observing how teachers operate in the classroom provides the deeper insights of what really happens (the implicit/operational and hidden curriculums) and teachers’ and students’ views and thoughts. Shaping the research project then required identifying a suitable target group and case situation. Drawing on the international IEA Civic Education Study (Torney-Purta et al., 2001) and ICCS study (Schulz et al., 2010), helped to shape and justify the case design. Like these studies, but in a qualitative, single case approach, I wanted to explore in a school setting the ways in which ‘young people are prepared to undertake their role as citizens in democracies’ (Torney-Purta et al., 2001). However, because these two international studies are so large in scope, only some of the areas covered by them were identified to be examined. In particular, ‘opportunities for discussion in the classroom and participation in the school’ across the formal and informal curriculums became the areas of focus (Torney-Purta et al., 2001: 13). The decision to choose an *ungdomsskole* (junior high school), was also related to the international studies’ focus on 14 year olds/students in Grade 8 (Year 9 in New Zealand). By examining some of the key findings from these studies, particularly in the Norwegian results, I could use them to ‘drill down’ into exploring qualitative questions that arose from the quantitative data.

3.4 WHY CHOOSE A CASE STUDY?

A case study is a popular way to collect data related to a *case*. As identified in the previous section, a single case would allow exploration of democratic practices within a school setting. Gillham (2000: 1) identifies a case as having four specific features:

- A unit of human activity embedded in the real world
- Which can only be studied or understood in context;
- Which exists in the here and now;
- That merges in with its context so that precise boundaries are difficult to draw.

This particular case within a school would fit all of these criteria. Other considerations were that ‘a case *study* is one which investigates the above to answer specific research questions...and which seeks a range of different kinds of evidence, evidence which is there in the case setting, and which has to be abstracted and collated to get the best possible answers to the research questions’ (Gillham, 2000: 1-2). The case study method works best ‘when a ‘how’ or ‘why’ question is being asked about a contemporary set of events over which the researcher has no control’, unlike experiments, (which also ask how and why questions but in a controlled environment) (Gray, 2004: 124). As identified in Chapter 1, the key questions I wanted to explore were *how* and *why* questions around democratic practice in a Norwegian school.

There are a number of case study advantages noted by researchers. This data collection approach is ‘strong in reality’, which makes them useful and actionable (Adelman, quoted in Bassey, 1999: 23) and they can ‘recognise the complexity and ‘embeddedness’ of social truths. By carefully attending to social situations, case studies can represent something of the discrepancies or conflicts held by participants’, which can also make them ‘powerful antidotes to determinism and over-generalization’ (Knight, 2002: 41). By their very nature of focusing on a single situation, case studies also tend to be small scale, very *human* (person-centred) (Knight, 2002), and rich in description (King et al., 1994). However the richness of the description means that they generate a lot of data, which can be time-consuming to evaluate (Gray, 2004).

Case study structure is an important consideration too. Yin (2009), in his significant work on case study research, identifies four different types of case studies. As this thesis uses a single-case design with a single-unit of analysis, I focus on the comments he makes regarding this approach. Five different rationales are given for using a single case study, it is the third one that is relevant here, that of the *representative or typical* case. Yin (2009: 48) notes that this kind of case study ‘may represent a typical “project” among many different projects’, such as a representative school, for example. The importance of this type of case lies in the fact that ‘the lessons learned from these cases are assumed to be informative about the experiences of the average person or institution’.

In a student-researcher context, qualitative case studies can be one of the most effective and least costly ways to conduct research. A student is not being paid for the hours they work, so if the research requires a considerable amount of observation time and data analysis, this is possible. Students are also likely to be lone researchers in the field so they have limited ability to carry out a larger scale project, and they usually have limited means (money to spend) on conducting the research, which also reduces the possible size and scope.

For me, limitations such as time, language (requiring an interpreter to be present during interviews and to translate documents), and cost (paying the above interpreter) all meant that my research was going to have to be small in scope. In considering my situation as a lone researcher in another country, choosing a case study of a single Norwegian school was manageable and yet the intent, following Yin (2009) is to select a representative example, and draw on a number of perspectives to build the case and reflect on wider ideas. Mutch (2003) also took this approach in her single qualitative case study of a New Zealand primary school practices of citizenship in the school and classroom.

3.5 CULTURAL RESEARCH CONSIDERATIONS

Ethnography, the study of culture, is often used in a case study context (and is considered here because of the researcher conducting the study in a different cultural environment to her own). 'Ethnographers, who closely and empathically study cultures and sub-cultures..., are great users of case studies' (Knight, 2002: 42). The prime mode of data collection for ethnographers is observation (as a participant or outside observer) which can be supported by interview data for clarification (Gray, 2004; Holliday, 2002). Due to the cultural nature of their research, ethnographers also 'pay particular attention to language and the ways in which terms are used' (Gray, 2004: 22). There are also different levels of participation in ethnographic studies. These include 'whether the researcher is known as such by all or some people in the setting', 'how much and what is known about the research and by whom, the researcher's involvement on the margins or at the centre of group activities, and the extent to which the researcher takes up a group persona (crudely, 'goes native')' (Knight, 2002: 57).

Coming from New Zealand, it was a challenge both to work out how to carry out research appropriately within the Norwegian culture and to understand the Norwegian school system. While Norway is another Western country and an established democracy with some cultural similarities to New Zealand, it was not clear how an outsider would be perceived requesting to carry out research. However, a positive response was received from the school approached through a Norwegian contact. Later, after attempts to contact other schools were without success, this link, sometimes described as 'gaining access to the field' (Flick, 2007) was acknowledged to have been a big advantage. However, the case study school's receptiveness to my research was perhaps also because of the kind of school they were, that the principal in particular understands the importance of students carrying out research. They were also willing to share the Norwegian way of doing democracy. That all of the people interviewed were generous in their insights about what they felt works and what doesn't in their school regarding democratic practice and citizenship education helped to give a balanced view. Amongst the adults in particular, their ability to self-reflect on their situation was, from the researcher's perspective, proved by the detailed level of information and analysis they gave (and perhaps the result of a *Bildung*-focused education in the past).

The Norwegian interpreter (a Masters student in English literature, as well as training to be a teacher) was also a good support for navigating cultural differences. Her command of the English language was at an advanced level, and her knowledge of the school system through her teacher training helped with explaining technical words and identifying differences between English and Norwegian in words and meanings. Being a teacher trainee also meant she quickly built a positive rapport with the teachers in the case study school, who were delighted to meet a future teacher.

3.6 SAMPLING STRATEGIES

There are a number of different sampling approaches that can be employed when carrying out any qualitative study. Miles and Huberman (cited in Creswell, 2007: 127), list sixteen different sampling strategies. Only a couple of strategies relevant to the thesis are explored here. Purposive sampling deliberately looks for 'certain types of element because those cases are judged to be typical of some case of interest to the researcher' (Tolich and Davidson, 2011: 81). Snowballing means beginning 'with a small number of respondents and ask them to recommend other people who would be relevant to the research' (Tolich and Davidson, 2011: 82).

In this case study, making contact with a key informant, who can give access to the field, in this case the principal, was central to being able to carry out the research. As the gate-keeper, with significant status within the school community, a principal's support is vital, in terms of providing information and teachers who were willing to be observed and/or interviewed. Those teachers in turn were also then used to further 'snowball' sample by asking students (and their parents' permission) to participate in the research on my behalf. The principal also contacted a parent representative to ask if they were willing to be interviewed.

3.7 RESEARCH VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

Validity 'refers to the extent to which a question or variable accurately reflects the concept the researcher is actually looking for'. (Tolich and Davidson, 2011: 69). Along the way, the researcher must move from an 'abstract theoretical concept to some concrete, empirical, measures of that concept' (Tolich and Davidson, 2011: 69). Validity can be both external and internal, as explained further below.

External validity refers to the generalizability of the findings gathered in the research. People also often argue that the findings of a case study are not generalizable to the wider population (Yin, 2009). However Bassey (1999: 11) argues that these kinds of 'studies of singularities' offers the wider literature what he calls 'fuzzy propositions and generalizations'. The results that can be claimed from these studies include 'that *it is possible, or likely, or unlikely that* what was found in the singularity will be found in similar situations elsewhere: it is a qualitative measure' (Bassey, 1999: 12). Some researchers also argue that research about other cultures should look beyond validity and prove its usefulness by being relevant to issues of public concern (Brewer, cited in Gray, 2004).

Internal validity refers to the design of the research project (specifically, that there are no errors in the research design)' (Tolich and Davidson, 2011: 70) Validity of interviews is 'related to the quality of the prompts and questions and to the informants' commitment. In interviews the skill of the interviewer and the amount of the time available also matter' (Knight, 2002: 63).

The detailed findings from the ICCS study on citizenship education in Norwegian schools meant that I did not need to be so concerned with high levels of external validity from my single case study. Instead I wanted to gather deeper insights into the practices and perspectives of teachers and students in the case study school, to answer the *how* and *why* questions surrounding democratic practices. Developing good questions for interviews was also important, using related literature and support from my supervisors, and by thinking about the information I needed to gather in order to

answer the wider research questions. Recording of interviews and observations was also carefully planned (using a digital recorder and detailed notes) to increase the reliability of the findings.

In terms of validity, while generalisations across Norwegian schools were never going to be possible from a single case study school, there is still a measure of usefulness in the findings, in several respects. First, that where the findings match the findings in the ICCS study, it can be argued, in the words of Bassey (1999: 11) that 'it is *likely* that' what was found in this school is typical of other Norwegian schools. Second, that the findings provide deeper insights and possible explanations for some of the wider trends found in the ICCS study, including the practices and perspectives that shape the Norwegian approach to citizenship education.

Qualitative research tends to be stronger on validity and less good on reliability. 'Reliability refers to consistency. A measure is 'reliable' if it produces the same results when repeated at a different time, in a different place, even when used by different researchers' (Tolich and Davidson, 2011: 70). One of the main problems with achieving this replication is that qualitative research is often conducted using observation. What may be interpreted from such observations may vary from time to time and from researcher to researcher. One way to strengthen reliability then, is to take detailed notes, so that in reviewing notes from one observation to another, or when reviewed by another researcher, it is possible to re-interpret what has been observed (Gray, 2004).

Triangulation is another important way to strengthen qualitative research findings. This process involves checking and re-checking the findings with participants as well as with other sources, and is of most benefit when three or more information sources are used (Gray, 2004, Yin, 2012). 'The interconnected data within the core setting are strengthened through triangulation with the periphery, [observations beyond the classroom, interviews, documentation and curriculum recommendations] but equally with interconnected data collected in the wider setting' (Holliday, 2002: 43). However sometimes participants appear to be in agreement, but are repeating the 'institutional mantra' rather than what actually happens. In this situation, observations can also help to correct and clarify these misunderstandings.

For this case study, ways to triangulate the data were set up, to strengthen and corroborate the research findings, particularly by conducting interviews with other education stakeholders in the wider school setting (an education official, a teacher-educator at the university and a parent representative), post the school data collection phase. All of these steps were taken to strengthen the validity and reliability of the completed study.

3.8 ETHICS

Thinking about ethics in research involves examining the ‘appropriateness of the researcher’s behaviour in relation to the subjects of the research or those who are affected by it’ (Gray, 2004: 58). Tolich and Davidson (Tolich and Davidson, 2011: 155) outline five core principles that social scientists should use when developing research projects:

1. Voluntary participation
2. Informed consent
3. Do no harm
4. Avoid deceit
5. Confidentiality or anonymity

In terms of keeping identities private, Tolich and Davidson point out that when working with a focus group, promises of confidentiality can only be limited to what the *researcher* does, that is ‘that the researcher will not identify any participant or what he or she said in any publication’ (2011: 159). You cannot prevent other participants from repeating what has been said to others outside of the group. As well, sometimes the nature of what is said, such as ‘distinctive views or experiences’, may also reveal the speaker (Knight, 2002: 64).

In evaluating and writing about classroom observations, ethical considerations are important here too. A researcher can bring experiences, skills and theoretical knowledge to classroom research, providing significant insights that are not necessarily accessible to teachers in their professional practice’ (Alton-Lee, 2001: 90). But she also says that dialogue between the researcher and teacher is critical to discuss and analyse what has been observed. She says this discussion is necessary because ‘the work of teachers occurs in a context that is constrained by multiple influences – many beyond the teacher’s own control’ (Alton-Lee, 2001: 90).

In the case study, some discussion after each observation was sought, where possible. This process helped give some context to the observations as to how typically a class had acted that day. The teachers also then had the opportunity to express how they felt about their teaching in that situation and any other significant thoughts and ideas they had to share.

Having to carry out my research following the University’s guidelines on ethics meant that all of the five principles noted by Tolich and Davidson (Tolich and Davidson, 2011), were considered. Because students under the age of 16 were being interviewed as part of the case study, a full ethics application was required. Participants in the study were presented with an information sheet (in Norwegian) that described the purpose of the research and what was required of them. This sheet also noted that their involvement was voluntary and they could withdraw at any stage if they wished. They then had to sign a consent form. Parents of the students were also sent the same information sheet and asked for written consent. I also showed participants the questions in advance so they could think about what they wanted to say.

In accordance with the University’s ethics guidelines, I also used pseudonyms and changed potentially identifying material to protect the identity of interviewees. In the conversations recorded in class observations, only the teacher was possibly identifiable, as I did not record the names of the

students participating in the class. I also did not note down the names of the students whose work I received copies of, instead the teacher just indicated on each one whether they were male or female. All of these practices were used to protect identities as much as possible, particularly of the students. While most of the adults who contributed to the research could probably be identified by people familiar with the city and schools, they were aware of this and not concerned, perhaps largely due to Norwegians having the right to say what they think, a powerful protection offered by the Norwegian constitution (as discussed further in Chapter 4).

3.9 DATA COLLECTION METHODS

In carrying out case studies, Yin (2009) proposes six data collection types: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant-observation and physical artefacts. In citizenship education research, (and consequently this thesis), three of these approaches are most commonly used – documentation, interviews, and direct observations (see, for example Mutch, 2003, Sim, 2010, Faden, 2012). As a result, this next section discusses these three ways of collecting data in more detail.

3.9.1 Documentation

For case studies, the most important use of documents is ‘to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources’ (Yin, 2009: 103). Documents can verify spellings and titles and names of organisations, which can be especially useful in a setting where the main language used is different to the researcher’s native language. Documents can also corroborate specific details given by other sources, and researchers can also draw inferences from what is written, for further investigation. A lot of background information on a case or people can be readily accessed from the internet or libraries (Creswell, 2007). However, all of these documents are secondary material, that is, they have been written not for the researcher’s case study but for another purpose. Keeping that in mind when looking for clues or analysis means it is less likely that the researcher misinterprets or is not sufficiently critical of the data this material may contain (Yin, 2009).

3.9.2 Interviews

A *focused interview* (as opposed to *in-depth* and *survey* interviews), involves a person being interviewed for a short time, say up to an hour (Yin, 2009). These kinds of interviews ‘may still remain open-ended [like in-depth interviews] and assume a conversational manner, but you are more likely to be following a certain set of questions derived from the case study protocol’ (Yin, 2009: 107). Using structured questions can also help the participant(s) by giving them questions in advance in order to prepare relevant answers and think about the topic beforehand. It is still necessary though to corroborate these verbal reports with other sources of evidence.

Focus groups are similar to focus interviews, except with more people. Using focus groups can be advantageous when: ‘the interaction among interviewees will likely yield the best information, when interviewees are similar and cooperative with each other, when time to collect information is limited, and when individuals interviewed one-on-one may be hesitant to provide information’ (Creswell, 2007: 133). Often all of these considerations apply when interviewing school students, especially when an interpreter may be present as well as the interviewer. Focus interviews are essential sources of case study evidence ‘because most case studies are about human affairs or behavioural events. Well-informed interviewees can provide important insights into such affairs or

events' (Yin, 2009: 108). Focus interviews are also 'far more open to complexity, ambiguity and things that had not been anticipated or considered' (Knight, 2002: 63). The advantage of this approach is that the researcher can change and alter the focus of data gathering as they find out more about the participants and their experiences along the way (Tolich and Davidson, 2011).

Recording interviews is not required, but can 'certainly provide a more accurate rendition of any interview than any other method' (Yin, 2009: 109). Transcribing the full record, while desirable, is also enormously time and energy-consuming (Knight, 2002). However capturing all the information given in this way provides the rich description that allows the reader to experience what it is like for the participants in the case study (Tolich and Davidson, 2011).

3.9.3 Direct observations

The opportunity for direct observations in a case study occur 'because a case study should take place in the natural setting of the "case"...this can involve observations of meetings...classrooms and the like' (Yin, 2009: 109). Classrooms can be good locations for observational research. 'The way in which they mirror the world outside is verified by the interest taken in them by 'a variety of [academic] disciplines'...they possess special features, such as routines and scripts which occur in a controlled context, which make them especially attractive to researchers' (Holliday, 2002: 42).

The conventional method of collecting observational data is to use your senses, taking field notes and 'ultimately creating a narrative based on what you might have seen, hear, or otherwise sensed' (Yin, 2012: 11). If a recording is used (e.g. digital recorder or video camera), that can also provide a more accurate transcription of events, albeit a much more lengthy one. However when it comes to the analysis stage, a more detailed description can also allow for better analysis.

The fact that these three data collection methods are often used in this type of case study, in this field of research (citizenship education) supported my reasons to use them. Using observations, interviews and documentation for the research meant that I could gather a wide and deep range of information and strengthen the findings through triangulation. Further details of the information collected are described in Chapter 4.

3.10 DATA ANALYSIS

When coding the data for analysis, to strengthen the findings Knight (2002) suggests several useful ideas. First, mix up cross-sectional analysis across your data with case-by-case looking at a whole interview or observation to see if you identify different things. Second, compare coding categories with other research data/theory to see if they fit, and third, take time to review your analysis, as new things can appear when you have had a break from it.

3.11 SUMMARY OF RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The approach used for this case study as discussed throughout this chapter, is summarised in the table below (Table 3.2). Further detailed discussion of the method continues in Chapter 4 (the case study findings).

Table 3.2 Summary of methods used in the Norwegian case study

| Overall approach and rationale | |
|---|---|
| Qualitative, single case, researching democratic practices in a Norwegian junior high school. | |
| Research questions | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is democracy and citizenship understood in the Norwegian curriculum? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>How much do societal/parental views and values uphold school learning about democracy and citizenship?</i> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is citizenship and democracy practised in an exemplar junior high or <i>ungdomsskole</i> in the formal curriculum? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How is citizenship and democracy practised in an exemplar junior high or <i>ungdomsskole</i> in the informal curriculum? | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What can other established democracies learn from the Norwegian case study example? | |
| Sampling strategies | |
| Purposive and snowballing through initial contact 'gate-keeper'. | |
| Validity and reliability | |
| Validity – compared with ICCS results (large quantitative study). | |
| Reliability – detailed, recorded notes taken, use of triangulation. | |
| Ethics | |
| Carried out in accordance with University of Canterbury ethics policies. | |
| Data collection methods | |
| Direct Observations | Grade 8 Social Studies, Norwegian and Religion/Ethics classes, Student Council meeting. |
| Interviews and focus groups | Interviews with principal, Social Studies teacher, Norwegian & Religion/Ethics teacher, Grade 8 students (4), Grade 10 students (6), parent representative, teacher-educator, education official. |
| Documents | Student writing articles, curriculum documents. |
| Data analysis | |
| Coded data to look for themes. | |

3.12 CONCLUSION

There are many different aspects to consider when developing an appropriate methodology as a single student researcher carrying out research on citizenship education in schools. This chapter demonstrates how a qualitative case study can make the best use of time and value for money by investigating an individual school case, and highlighting cultural considerations of the research. Careful thought about the best way to collect data and analyse it helps to ensure a smoother process. Research ethics in such a study as this needed to be properly addressed, especially when interviewing young people across cultural contexts. Using this methodology, if conducted and analysed well as previous studies have shown, can give useful insights and commentary on citizenship education and result in a worthwhile contribution to the field.

The following chapter, 'The Case Study', outlines the details of the case, and presents the findings from the interviews, observations and documentation. These are organised into three major sections based on the three research questions above. In Chapter 5, I then discuss the implications of my findings for practitioners and theorists in established democracies, along with discussion of the research methodology used, before offering suggestions for future research and drawing some conclusions.

CHAPTER 4. THE CASE STUDY: PRACTISING DEMOCRACY IN A NORWEGIAN *UNGDOMSSKOLE*

I don't want to be arrogant, but I believe in a Norwegian way of doing things. In my view, in a corner of my soul so to speak, is a kind of... 'everybody matters'. I think that is a part of a Norwegian's way of thinking. It's like this, we have built our [social] system since World War II, and in the same way we have built our school system. We give the same opportunity to everybody, and sooner or later you will find out what to do [with your life]... We are here to allow all young people to participate.

Interview with Parent Representative, September 2013

4.1 INTRODUCTION

There is little research published in English that explores what actually happens in Norwegian schools in terms of democratic practice, particularly written for a wider academic audience (Børhaug, 2008, Fjeldstad et al., 2009). Yet it is an area of research worth examining because of the high level of democratic practice that is recorded as occurring in Norway, particularly in junior high school (*ungdomsskole*), (see for example the ICCS study, 2010). As a result, a case study approach examining the practices and perspectives of those involved in a single *ungdomsskole* was seen as the best method to answer these 'how' and 'why' questions (Yin, 2009) within the scale of a Master's thesis. This chapter describes this research: the process I followed, who I talked to, what I observed and recorded during my time there. The data collection process is outlined first, then I present the findings based on the research questions identified in previous chapters.

4.2 DATA COLLECTION

I arrived in Trondheim, Norway in September 2012, to live for a year, travelling from the other side of the world (Christchurch, New Zealand) with my husband and two children. Through a recommendation from local Norwegian settlement advisors I was introduced to the principal of a local *ungdomsskole* in November. Following Yin's theoretical sampling technique, I was interested in locating a local school with a known interest in democratic teaching. I outlined the research ethics procedures and asked if his school would consider participating in my research project. He agreed, and I carried out my research over five months from March-September 2013 (the summer school holidays were in July-August with no research being done over that period). The school was an 8-10 grade (Year 9-11 in New Zealand) junior high school (*ungdomsskole*) in Trondheim, a city of 180,000 people in Mid-Norway. The case study school selected was urban and state-funded, with between 300-400 students, with the majority of students (around 90%) born in Norway, within a community of reasonably affluent, well-educated parents (Interview with principal, March 2013). Some of the other sixteen *ungdomsskolen* in the city have much higher proportions of immigrant students but this school is well respected in the area for supportive leadership and a strong teacher focus on pedagogy (Interview with Education official, September 2013; Interview with Parent, September 2013), enabling me to view some best practice teaching.

Data collection involved initial field interviews with education practitioners and students, observations and follow up interviews (see Table 4.1). Interview length varied depending on the number of questions and the participants. Most interviews with adults were around an hour in length, the interviews with students were shorter, around half an hour.

Triangulation using interviews from different perspectives (as noted in chapter 2) was used to strengthen the findings, as well as comparing the results of the observations, interviews and focus groups to confirm and/or verify statements by individuals reported below.

Table 4.1: Summary of data collection approaches used

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Practitioners interviews | The principal, a social studies teacher and Norwegian/religious studies teacher. |
| Class observations | The observations included social studies, Norwegian and religion classes (with around 25 students in a class), a student council meeting, and review of student sample writing. |
| Student focus groups | Year 8 and Year 10 students. Four of these students were also class representatives for the student council, and two were members of a school political club. |
| Review of draft results | Interviews with an education official from the local council, a teacher-educator (professor) from the local university, and a parent representative on the parent council (FAU). |

Demographically speaking, all of the interview participants (both students and adults) were ethnic Norwegians, however in the class observations there were immigrant students present, a few of them recent (with limited knowledge of Norwegian) and others with parents who had come from other countries. The Grade 8 students were 13-14 year olds, while the Grade 10 students were aged 15-16.

4.2.1 Interviews and focus groups

The interview questions focused on how young Norwegians learn about democracy at school, in a practical context. With the teachers and principal, questions were about the students' interest in democracy, what they thought was important to teach the students' about democracy, and whether they discussed current events and controversial topics. I also asked about ways students are involved in decision-making within the school. With the students, the questions asked were about their interest in politics and democracy, what they thought of being taught those subjects at school, and their views on climate change⁴ as related to themselves, to Norway as a country, and the wider world.

Following ethics guidelines, most of the interviews with participants from the case study school were held at the school itself, with the exception of the parent representative, who at his request, met with me at a coffee shop near my house as it was not far from his workplace. The meeting with the official from the municipality (*Kommune*) took place in the *Kommune* offices in downtown Trondheim, while I went to the university (NTNU) to meet with the professor.

All the interviews were digitally recorded as oral interviews, and a single interpreter was used throughout the data collection process, present in interviews with the researcher and assisting

⁴ Questions were asked about students' views on climate change in connection with the Voices of the Future project (the University of Oslo).

transcription. Some of the interviews were entirely in Norwegian, some a mix of Norwegian and English, and two, with the professor and the parent, entirely in English. While many Norwegians (including the young people) speak good English they were able to be more articulate and express what they meant more easily in Norwegian so interpretation was always offered. The interpreter was known to me, and thoroughly briefed in the project. The presence of the interpreter was helpful as a researcher, allowing discussion of results and the subtle nuance of language meanings was reflected in discussion after the interviews.

Interviewees were given the interview questions beforehand, in Norwegian, although supplementary questions were asked to probe issues raised during the interview or to clarify a point or find out more about a particular topic. What was recorded was this whole interview process: my interpreter asking them a written question and their response. If their reply was given in Norwegian, my interpreter would then give me the answer in English⁵.

Discussion with the interpreter after interviews and observations was used as a way of debriefing, along with discussions with teachers about what we had observed. In the course of study as the researcher's fluency in Norwegian increased, the reflection was still useful and there was less need for breaks for translation but reflection proved invaluable for interviews. Students and adults were interviewed in accordance with University of Canterbury ethics policy and were given the opportunity to vet their transcripts with the help of the interpreter if needed.

Interview length varied depending on the number of questions and the participants. Most interviews with adults were around an hour in length, the interviews with students were shorter, around half an hour.

4.2.2 Observations

Stage two of research involved observations which were carried out while visiting the school for interviews or focus group discussions (Table 4.2). These included observing Grade 8 Norwegian, Religion/Ethics and Social Studies classes, and a student council meeting (comprising representatives from all grades, two from each class).

Table 4.2: Classes observed by type and number of class

| Observations | Number of classes |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| Grade 8 Norwegian | 1 |
| Grade 8 Religion/Ethics | 2 |
| Grade 8 Social Studies | 1 |
| Student Council Meeting | 1 |

⁵ The English questions and answers then became the transcripts. This was required due to cost constraints for full transcription by an interpreter. The interviews were accompanied by note-taking as a backup in case the recording didn't work; these also proved to be useful as a reference until the transcripts were complete.

The class observations concentrated on teaching about democracy, where possible. Class discussions about a range of topics were observed. Class sessions were between 45 minutes and an hour and a half.

4.2.3 Writing topics

I also collected a sample (10 articles) of students' writing that was based on the Grade 8 Norwegian class I had observed (Table 4.3). There were a range of topics covered, some of which had had quite a lot of discussion in the media, such as begging, waving flags in the parade on their national day and the Øygard case (he was a mayor of a small town).

Table 4.3: Writing topic by gender for Grade 8 Norwegian class

| Writing Topic | Written by |
|---|------------|
| Energy Strikes | Boy |
| Bridge collapse at Leangen | Boy |
| Ferry-free E39 (highway) | Boy |
| Øygard (a legal case, sexual abuse of a minor) | Girl |
| Flag-parade or parade with flags? (17 May) | Girl |
| Road toll stations | Boy |
| Tornado in Oklahoma | Boy |
| Petter Northug leaves the national cross country ski team | Boy |
| Age limits for movies that give nightmares, or not? | Girl* |
| Ban begging, yes or no? | Boy |

* Given the highest mark in class.

4.3 FINDINGS 1: HOW IS DEMOCRACY AND CITIZENSHIP UNDERSTOOD IN THE NORWEGIAN CURRICULUM?

This first research question examines the ways in which democracy and citizenship are understood in the Norwegian curriculum. Several aspects of Norwegian practices were considered worth commenting on. First was the way that democracy is incorporated across the curriculum, not just in specific subjects. Views of citizenship, including freedom, equality and the role of the Constitution are also important factors to consider. Finally, how societal and parental views underpin and support teacher practice.

The main finding in this area is that in spite of a very prescriptive-intended curriculum with expectations that democracy and citizenship practices are evident across the *ungdomsskole* there is variability in practice. One of the key features of Norwegian education includes teachers' strong personal and collective beliefs in the importance of democracy, and strong societal and parental support for these beliefs. However, the teachers' interviews and observations suggest that while they are able and do use a variety of participatory learning approaches in their teaching, they could use them more. One barrier to that may be the resistance teachers display if they think these kinds of changes may threaten their autonomy, as noted by other education stakeholders interviewed in the case study. The students would like to have different approaches used more, and more negotiation involved in how the curriculum is taught. Some students believe they learn better when they are allowed to contribute to decision-making.

4.3.1 Democracy across the curriculum

One of the key features of Norwegian education includes teachers' strong personal and collective beliefs in the importance of democracy. Teaching about democracy is understood by teachers to be across and beyond subject areas, not just limited to them, as the education official from the local municipality explains:

RESEARCHER: Perhaps from your experience as a teacher then, and your knowledge in this job, what do you know about how democracy and citizenship are taught in *ungdomsskole* here?

OFFICIAL: We give it a lot of attention. We even have a specific subject in school, but now, after a lot of discussion, it is something that needs to be present in all subjects at school.

RESEARCHER: Do you think the reforms in education (*Kunnskapsløftet*) will reduce Norway's focus on citizenship education?

OFFICIAL: I don't really think it will. Some have criticised the focus on maths and reading but I don't think that's a big matter.

RESEARCHER: Why don't you think it will? Do teachers still believe democracy to be an important part of what they teach?

OFFICIAL: Yes.

Later in the interview the official expands further on this collective understanding and value that teachers have for democracy:

OFFICIAL: The general part of *Kunnskapsløftet* (the Knowledge Promotion curriculum reform) is really important, because that's where the main focus of the curriculum is set down, and that includes democracy as well. And it's an important part of the consciousness of the teachers. They go to work and do their job, [but] there are values there, in the general part of the curriculum, that they don't want to lose.

Teacher values of democracy are personal and go deeper than policy expectations (the intended curriculum). Because these values are personal as well as professional, perhaps this makes teachers resist changes that they think are likely to erode their ability to transmit those values to their students. Likewise, the principal comments that the impact of average PISA results and subsequent education reforms has not changed teaching practice as much as might be assumed:

RESEARCHER: I'm aware of the PISA results and how that has made Norway focus on achievement in maths, English, science. Do you think that has changed teachers' focus to these things and away from others like being a democratic school? Or has that not really changed?

PRINCIPAL: Yes I think it has changed, to some extent. But I don't think it has changed as much as some people wish it had. I think the individual teacher's consciousness and focus on these issues is greater than before. And I think that most teachers view the change to assessment for learning as positive and right. And [the reforms] bring better results – in maths, in English, in Norwegian, in reading and writing, in all subjects.

The professor had a view that supported the principal's view about resistance to adopting new teaching methods, particularly the increased use of a negotiated curriculum. He explained it as being related to the reforms that started in 1994, describing it as the point at which 'politicians started telling teachers what to do':

It really came up in the reform process in 1994. Teachers were not given guidance, teachers were not shown how to [include students in decision-making], teachers were not introduced to the learning options, so they could put out meaningful choices to students. They said 'are we going to ask students what they should learn? We know what they should learn'. Of course, but you can still ask students meaningful questions. You can approach your teaching [in this way]. Some of the teachers were provoked because they felt invaded, their authority [had been challenged]...this was the start of the politicians telling the teachers what to do.

Interview with professor, September 2013

In asking others about this strong sense of teacher autonomy and whether that was the case, the education official agreed:

RESEARCHER: It does seem to me that Norwegian teachers have what I would call a high level of autonomy?

OFFICIAL: Yes, they have.

RESEARCHER: Does that make it difficult to roll out something? You know, when everyone is doing their own thing?

OFFICIAL: Yes, it does. This aspect of autonomy, we notice that teachers are very protective of their right to plan their own teaching and make their own teaching, and on the positive side that makes for very strong teachers who are very capable and who often offer very good teaching, but on the other hand it can be difficult to get teachers to work well together as a team or in the community as teachers, because they really protect their right to be autonomous, to be in charge of their own teaching.

It's hard to make the teachers all walk at the same speed and with the same rhythm!

Interview with education official, September 2013

Both the professor and the official's comments highlight the difficulties of rolling out education reforms, and perhaps indicate why the pace of change in Norwegian schools has not been particularly fast. They also reveal the resistance of Norwegian teachers to the changes to their values and identity as teachers that neoliberal reforms require (Ball, 2003). The professor also commented that this attitude still exists among teachers, as he discovered when he was invited to speak to social studies teachers in Trondheim about increasing participation in school, following the 22 July 2011 Norwegian terror attacks. He received a negative response from the teachers following his talk because he was encouraging them to listen to and include students' views:

I had a very disappointing experience. We had our 9/11, the 22 July. And after that [there was] a gathering of social science teachers in Trondheim, there were quite a lot of them there. They had some planning days, and so I was invited to lecture about this [22 July event]. I hesitated a bit, then said well, yes, [because] I thought of an idea of how to do this. So I grabbed [Norwegian Prime Minister] Stoltenberg's slogan 'more democracy'. What should it mean, to the school? I tell you, some teachers were so frustrated [with me]. They were even angry with me. And the woman who invited me, she... I really couldn't tell what [I had said that] was so provocative. But I [had been] invited to speak about 'more participation in school'. It was like hitting a wall.

Interview with professor, September 2013

The teachers' response reflects that this was a message they didn't want to hear. As the professor then went on to explain:

Some of the teachers were provoked because they felt invaded, their authority [had been challenged], regardless of the fact that participation processes in class can be very good for students, they can learn a lot, they can take more control and develop their knowledge.

Interview with professor, September 2013

Teacher resistance may serve a useful purpose in terms of preserving values that are important to Norwegians from being steamrolled by neoliberal agendas and policy through education reforms. However, it appears that teachers are not really resisting reforms around teaching practices per se, but because they are resistant to the source of the reforms (the government). This sets up a complicated conundrum: on the one hand teachers may do well to resist the reforms of 'the market, managerialism and performativity' (Ball, 2003: 215), however it equally limits their ability to adapt their practice on democracy and citizenship to better reflect a changing society. I expand on this point further in the second findings section on the formal curriculum.

4.3.2 Views of citizenship: freedom, equality and the Norwegian Constitution

With Norway's national day (17 May) of celebrating the signing of their constitution in 1814 rapidly approaching while I was observing classes, several teachers reminded their classes about the importance of the Norwegian constitutional rights to freedom of speech and print [writing]. The Norwegian constitution was written after the French and American ones (and Swedish, Dutch and Polish, among others) so drew on parts of many constitutions in its development, creating what is considered to be one of the most comprehensive constitutions ever written (Tønnesson, 2001). Observation suggests it is important not to underestimate the power of this document for underpinning Norwegians' strong views on people having the right to say what they think (written or spoken) and this is strongly emphasised in school, as the following excerpt from a Grade 8 Norwegian class observation shows:

TEACHER: Now I am going to give you an example. So if I write this word on the blackboard, *frihet* (freedom).

STUDENT 1: It's like when you can do whatever you want.

TEACHER: [To another student], what's freedom?

STUDENT 2: It's in the Constitution of Norway...that you can have your own opinions, and your own thoughts.

TEACHER: But what did you say first – yes, it's part of the Norwegian Constitution...there it says we are allowed to have our own freedoms. It's called the freedom of speech. Do we have something other than the freedom of speech in Norway?

[No answer from the class]

Printing freedom. That you can write in newspapers and say your opinions and present different issues - *ytringsfrihet* [freedom of expression].

TEACHER: [asks another student]

STUDENT 3: You can fly.

TEACHER: There's an expression called 'being free as a bird'. It's like a metaphor for freedom. So what does it mean?

STUDENT 3: Fly, or swim in the ocean...

STUDENT 4: [It's a metaphor for] Democracy. It means everyone can decide and make decisions together.

TEACHER: The opposite of democracy is dictatorship.

STUDENT 4: In a dictatorship there is only one person deciding. So he can say all the schools are going to close down and no one can protest. In North Korea there is a dictator and what he says is the norm...

TEACHER: Yes, and what does that have to do with school?

STUDENT 4: So if he wants to he can just close the schools down. No one can say what they want, what their opinion is.

TEACHER: [clarifying] And that's not freedom. That's the farthest away from freedom that you can get.

STUDENT 1: And not everyone is allowed to go to school there [in North Korea].

TEACHER: Is going to school freedom in a democracy?

STUDENT 1: We have a right to go to school.

STUDENT 5: Here in Norway, we have chosen to give people the right to go to school, so that is a kind of freedom, and a kind of democracy.

Grade 8 Norwegian class observation, May 2013

This teacher explained that learning about democracy and freedom, and the French and American Revolutions as contributors to the Norwegian Constitution is an early part of learning in Grade 8. It is not surprising then that the response from one grade 10 student when asked about what it means for a young person to be a citizen in Norway today replied, 'To make use of the freedom of speech, to vote at elections and so on' (Grade 10 student, focus group interviews, May 2013). Young

Norwegians are encouraged and informed of their rights as citizens both now (freedom of expression) and as citizens in the future (right to vote etc.), giving them confidence and certainty in their identity within the state from a young age. For immigrants, this confidence may not be so strong, particularly if their voice as a migrant is not acknowledged in the Norwegian classroom, or if they have not had ongoing reinforcement through years of citizenship education in their country of origin (or if they come from a country where people do not trust government institutions in the same way).

The excerpt below shows how students are encouraged to think more widely beyond simple notions of citizenship (a passport), and think about what makes you a member of a community, a demos. The teacher also attempts to raise awareness of the multicultural nature of Norwegian society today, that skin-colour doesn't have anything to do with citizenship, and to point out that these changes have been happening within the country over decades. The nature of citizenship also becomes personal when one student acknowledges that they are not a Norwegian citizen and causes all the students to reflect (using *Bildung*) on their own standing and identity in the community.

TEACHER: Who are Norwegians?

STUDENT [boy]: I don't really know. Norwegian citizens?

STUDENT [girl]: Can't we just have our own opinion about that?

TEACHER: What other alternatives are there?

STUDENT: Those who are ethnic Norwegians.

[The teacher writes this on the blackboard]

STUDENT: I just have to say, that it's not certain, even if you're a Norwegian citizen, you know, on paper, it doesn't mean that person feels like a Norwegian citizen, if they are from a different country.

TEACHER: So being a Norwegian citizen, on paper, is not necessarily an all-inclusive definition of a Norwegian. You know, feelings are not a part of that definition, when we kind of go in and objectively say 'well, who is Norwegian?' Are there other alternatives than these two? Citizenship and ethnicity?

STUDENT: Another definition would be: those who live here are Norwegian.

TEACHER: Some people think for you to be Norwegian you have to be born in Norway. During the 1960s the first immigrants came to Norway and they came from lots of places, but mostly from Pakistan and Morocco, and mostly they came to work in the factories with paper and rubber. There weren't enough Norwegian workers, there weren't enough Norwegians in Norway to work so they had to bring in foreign workforces. So first they came as workers, but then they invited their families to join

them in Norway. They usually came as 18-19 year olds, and then later they would bring their wife from Morocco or Pakistan. Then they would settle down here. Those people who came here, they are now grandparents. That means that their children were born in Norway, and their grandchildren were born in Norway, and some of them may even have great grandchildren now. Are they Norwegian then?

SOME STUDENTS: Yes!

STUDENT 1: What kind of skin colour do they have?

STUDENT 2: Their own!

TEACHER: What kind of skin colour does a Pakistani have? They're darker, yes.

STUDENT: Maybe like [x] [student in the class]?

TEACHER: No, not that dark.

[She compares two different students in the class]

TEACHER: They are kind of different! That's what it's like. But they are Norwegians. [Teacher asks some students in the class if they are Norwegian citizens]

STUDENT: No, I don't have that.

The concept of freedom as a central tenet of a Norwegian's view of citizenship does not stand alone. The other central idea that recurred in the interviews was that of equality. The parent representative in a wonderful summary called it the 'Norwegian way', referring to it as 'everybody matters' and about giving the same opportunity to all:

I don't want to be arrogant, but I believe in a Norwegian way of doing things. In my view, in a corner of my soul so to speak, is a kind of... 'everybody matters'. I think that is a part of a Norwegian's way of thinking. It's like this, we have built our [social] system since World War II, and in the same way we have built our school system. We give the same opportunity to everybody, and sooner or later you will find out what to do [with your life]. I am active within the sports association, and one of the main principles...we are not at the forefront, we are one of many sports associations, and the main aim is to keep the children and the young people in our sports association as long as possible. We are not here to produce that girl or that guy who is supposed to be the new star of the Norwegian soccer team. We are here to allow all young people to participate.

Interview with Parent Representative, September 2013

Again, this example shows how in practical ways such as sports the right to participate is shared with young people, shaping their views and sense of belonging, of membership to a larger entity from a young age, regardless of skills and ability.

The Norwegian/Religion teacher also made references to equality, saying that she thought that for most teachers, underpinning their teaching about religion and ethics was 'the sense that everyone is equal - men and women, children and older people.' But her comments went on to emphasise that this was not just limited to teachers of ethics but represented a much wider societal view:

I think it is in every political party too, there are no political parties in Norway that mean something different, they all mean the same, that all humans are equal.

Interview with Norwegian/Religion teacher, May 2013

The principal also summed up his views on running the school as a shared endeavour in which everyone has a say:

I am quite happy with what the situation is today. I get to affect the way the school is run and how the curriculum works. That's how I understand it. The students have a right and an obligation to be heard, on the same level and understanding as the teachers.

Interview with Principal, March 2013

Across the three staff interviewed in this school there is clear respect for the students' rights to have a say in the running of the school. The comments from the municipality official also imply that these attitudes exist more widely across Norwegian schools. As I found in the next section when I explored the ways in which democracy is practised within the school, it is harder for teachers to action these beliefs every day.

4.3.3 How much do societal/parental views and values uphold school learning about democracy and citizenship?

The idea that democracy was an important personal and collective value and not just something that was in the curriculum to be taught became evident as I progressed through the interviews. The Principal clearly had strong personal views on the value of teaching about democracy, as well as his responsibility to the curriculum. One example he gave was, 'I think it's really important that students are able to express when they learn best and how they learn best and in that way be able to participate in a democratic way'. I noted this down to ask others, only to find during my interviews with them that they brought it up before I could ask. The City Council education official explained it the best:

In our national curriculum, democracy is something that's important. But we also have a really high consciousness in Norway in general, about democracy, and we value democracy, it's something that's really stuck with us, within us as a core value. And especially the way the world looks today, I think we even more value, guard and protect our democracy, and that applies no matter which party you are voting for in an election. That's part of democracy as well, and it gives us a lot of freedom.

Interview with Trondheim Kommune education official, September 2013

The official also highlighted the role of the youth city council in showing young people that they could have a voice in the way the city is run:

We also have the youth city council, which we have worked hard to establish, we have two employees who work specifically with the youth city council on a large level. They have developed it a lot. Members are recruited from both *ungdomsskole* and senior high school, and that has definitely been a factor that has made people more aware and more conscious about democracy and those issues through the youth city council. It also shows that it matters to be involved, that democracy is important.

Interview with Trondheim Kommune education official, September 2013

However the parent representative noted that as a group, the parents who are classroom representatives have not supported the students as much as they could have during his time as a member of the *FAU*, the parent council. He considers that parents have let down the students by not identifying ways in which they could have supported them better. Although parents participate as classroom representatives within the school, in this instance they were quite passive in their roles:

RESEARCHER: ...You said yourself that as a young person you were not interested [in politics/democratic processes], but now you have become a [part of] a democratic process, in the school for your children. So somewhere along the way you've taken on board some of those things, the importance of participating, this is your contribution?

PARENT: Yes...Part of the answer is that I always step forward if there is something to do, I want to be a part of it...I think it's important to get involved, to be part of the discussion not only the answer, and I'm a bit disappointed in the parents who haven't raised any issues, because if we want a strong *FAU*, if we want our school to be as good as possible, we should do our part. We're supposed to do our part. Of course the central body can act on our behalf.

RESEARCHER: But you're meant to also represent that wider group?

PARENT: Yes. To be effective, we have to have the parents with us. And we haven't been able to do that. And I think that's sad, too bad.

RESEARCHER: So you think there could have been opportunities to do more things, or there are issues that could have been addressed better?

PARENT: Yes.

RESEARCHER: How? If [the parents] had talked to the students more, or just been more interested?

PARENT: More interested in raising issues. We cannot do much of course, but we did arrange [some] thematic evenings about [a particular topic of interest to the students].

Interview with parent representative, September 2013

This commentary raises an interesting point about the kinds of citizens (most of) these parents are acting as. Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) Personally Responsible (good) citizen type would seem to be most likely, as these parents are doing their roles but with little sense of responsibility or notions of how to improve, while the parent interviewed has taken on a leadership role (Participatory citizen), and looked to change the way things are done and to try and offer the students more benefits by providing topics of interest. How the students view their parents in these roles would be an interesting topic for further research, and how the parents' level of participation (or lack of it, in spite of being a representative) shapes students' personal views of citizenship.

A parent at a conference workshop where some of my preliminary research findings were presented noted the tension and pressures they feel (Transformation Conference workshop notes, June 2013). Parents are torn between feeling proud of their children engaging in critical thinking/democratic thinking, and fear that Norwegian children are not achieving in reading and maths because of poor PISA results.

4.4 FINDINGS 2. HOW IS DEMOCRACY PRACTISED IN THE FORMAL CURRICULUM?

This next section of the findings explores the research question of how democracy is practised in the case study ungdomsskole, within the formal curriculum. The data shows that *Bildung* ideas and approaches underpin much of the practice around participatory learning, deliberation and relationships within the classroom. Teachers could involve students more in participatory learning, while deliberation tends to take the focus of the rational autonomous individual. But there is a great deal of freedom and willingness by teachers to discuss controversial issues in an open way, and teachers see building positive relationships with students as an important part of helping them to safely express their views and perspectives in the classroom. All of these approaches help students to build a number of skills around democratic practice. These findings are summed up in Table 4.4, which highlights representative comments of the participants in each area (*Bildung*, participatory learning, deliberation through dialogue, controversial topics, shared stories, and in the informal relationships between teachers and students).

Table 4.4: Representative comments on the way democracy is practised within the formal curriculum in the *ungdomsskole*

| Understanding the <i>Bildung</i> learning approach | |
|--|---|
| Teachers/Principal | Norwegian/Religion teacher: '[the students] are going to try to be objective, to see it from two sides' |
| Students | Grade 8 girl: 'enough freedom creates a little exciting and varied life where you are free to make your own choices' |
| Other stakeholders (official, teacher-educator, parent) | Parent: '[opportunities] where all the students from all the classes can work with one issue to bring different points of view' |
| Participatory learning approaches (Defined as class voting, group inquiry, simulations, fieldwork, co-operative learning) | |
| Teachers/Principal | <p>Norwegian/Religion teacher: 'Sometimes [I ask what they think], and sometimes not' '[One time] I arranged a vote...[and] the groups that didn't get their way got kind of mad!'</p> <p>Social Studies teacher: 'I think the [fieldtrips] are very important and I would like to have a good quality tour in 10th grade for every class'; 'it's important to use smartboards and show videoclips' 'We are not good enough, I think, on student participation. We do a lot of things but we could be better'</p> <p>Principal: 'the teachers don't know how to adapt these democratic aims to their own subject and their own teaching'</p> |
| Students | <p>Grade 8 boy: '[I like it] when we as students get to participate and have discussions among us'</p> <p>Grade 8 girl: 'I think it is a lot better to see films'</p> <p>Grade 8 boy: 'students actually know a lot about how they learn and what they are interested in, and teachers should know that, and be open to that'</p> <p>Grade 8 girl: 'I think we should have more to say, especially about how things are done'</p> |
| Other stakeholders (official, teacher-educator, parent) | Education Official: 'Because teachers (and the <i>Kommune</i>) create expectations among young people and say that you will be able to participate and so on, but it's also that the pupils don't always register when they are actually participating in democratic processes' |

| Practising deliberation through... | |
|--|---|
| Discussion and dialogue | |
| Teachers/Principal | Principal: 'I think that it is age-appropriate between 10 and 12 [years] to start contributing with their own opinions. But students here, 15-16 years old, they can contribute a lot, in different areas' |
| Students | Grade 10 girl: 'I really like discussions as well in class, where you can hear other student's opinions' |
| Other stakeholders (official, teacher-educator, parent) | Parent: 'This school is very good at putting the issues in front of the students... [and] where all the students from all the classes can work with that one issue to bring different points of view' Education official: 'I think [discussion is] a way of teaching, of involving the pupils in the learning process' |
| Controversial topics | |
| Teachers/Principal | Social Studies teacher: 'but then an important part of Norwegian democracy is that we talk about everything' 'I have never had a phone call or mail from parents about the subjects we are teaching. So maybe that's a good sign' Norwegian/Religion teacher: 'we have to be careful also, when you let them speak...But it's a very fun class, it's more exciting to go into this class because you don't always know what will come up' |
| Students | Grade 10 girl: 'like in religion, we quite recently had discussions about abortion and euthanasia and that makes people more conscious.' |
| Other stakeholders (official, teacher-educator, parent) | Education official: 'I hope they have [talked about lots of topics]! I think it's quite usual to have discussions about actual political issues' |
| Storytelling | |
| Teachers/Principal | Class observation of personal stories told by the Norwegian/Religion teacher and the Social Studies teacher |
| Students | Class observation of personal stories told by students during Norwegian, Religion/Ethics and Social Studies classes |
| The relationship between teachers and students | |
| Teachers/Principal | Norwegian/Religion teacher: 'they have opinions and they dare to say them. And they can disagree and then they can be friends [again]' 'Being seen, acknowledged by other people is really important' |
| Students | Grade 8 boy: 'I don't feel that we get to participate a lot in these issues, that the teacher decides everything' 'The teacher listens to what we say, but if they have already made up their mind, they don't do anything about it' Grade 8 girl: 'I think we should have more to say, especially about how things are done, but I think teachers should have a lot of say in what [topics] we work with, because they know what is coming ahead, for example' |
| Other stakeholders (official, teacher-educator, parent) | Teacher-educator: 'You need to tell the truth, you need to be sincere, you need to listen to other people, you need to personalise it. The point is to argue, and you need to show respect for others' |

4.4.1 Understanding the *Bildung* learning approach

The Norwegian curriculum emphasises the development of young people as critical thinkers, with objectives in most of the main curriculum areas (Norwegian, Social Studies, Religion/Ethics, Maths and Science). This critical thinking philosophy is largely drawn from *Bildung*, the German philosophy of understanding different sides of an argument as part of realising your own intellectual development. A number of comments from the adults interviewed in the case study made comments that link to this learning approach, and explain its purpose as a way of teaching young people. The parent talked about school as a place to ‘sharpen their minds’ and ‘involve them in the big questions’, while also acknowledging that expecting young people to solve the world’s problems is unrealistic:

The school system should sharpen their minds so that they make the right choices, engaging themselves, involving themselves in the big questions. But expecting 15, 16 or 17-year-olds should have the answers for the future, I don’t think so [laughs]. But we should make them aware of it and then let them go, I think.

Interview with parent representative, September 2013

Further in the interview the parent acknowledges the sense of journey that *Bildung* also encapsulates (Varkøy, 2010), and that learning and developing as a person (and learning about things like democracy and citizenship) is a step by step process which the student must experience for themselves. The parent notes his concern that if he gives his daughter every opportunity too soon in life she will have nothing left to do in the rest of her life, and will be, as he describes it ‘overfed’:

We are here to give them some sort of platform, support them, but they have to do things for themselves in the end. I think that’s a very sound way of doing things, because...the main problem with young people today, at the age of 16-17, they know everything! There is nothing more to do, because they have done it all! And if I put my daughter into every situation that I want her to have an opinion on, test her in every way before she is 18, she will be ‘overfed’. She has to go step by step.

Interview with parent representative, September 2013

Bildung as a learning approach was also evident in the writing sample collected from some Grade 8 students. The students observed in the Norwegian class discussion were preparing to write an editorial-style article in which they were expected to give different perspectives on a current issue being debated in the media or in politics. The completed articles covered a range of diverse topics. The teacher said that this type of writing was new for the students, they had not written like this previously:

Usually they are expected to write 2 to 3 pages, but because they are doing this [writing an article] for the first time I said its okay [to do less] because for some of them it can be very difficult to write. They have just been writing stories until now, so that’s something different from being objective. So now they are going to try to be objective, to see it from two sides.

The students wrote these articles in May, near the end of their first year in *ungdomsskolen*. The article that received the highest mark was written by a girl, about the new age limits proposed for watching movies in Norway. She writes a balanced commentary on the proposed changes by considering the views of children, parents and the Norwegian Media Authority (who regulates ages), as shown in this excerpt:

Age limits for movies are here for a reason, but what if they do not match reality? Some parents are shocked by the age restrictions of some movies and they want a new system. Children and young people are also taking part in the debate of who will have nightmares, though the Media Authority has determined that you are not yet old enough to not have nightmares?

‘Santander’ believes the opposite and does not care much about age limits. “I am 14 years old and love exciting and scary film. I look at the film that has both 15 and 18-year age restrictions. My parents do not care very much about what I see because they know I can tolerate it.” This 14-year-old says that he/she is not terrified of scary movies, but others may be. Although some children are anxious about going to school, that should not prohibit schooling. The same applies to film. Although one person in the theatre may be anxious about watching the movie, the movie should not be banned. Most people appreciate, trust and respect age limits, but many also believe that there should be an age rating between 11 and 15, such as 13. If you take blockbuster movies such as ‘The Hunger Games’, it had an 11 year age restriction, but the theatre program in the newspaper stated that it was recommended for 13+.

In the final excerpt from the article, she concludes with the argument that people should have the freedom to make their own judgements about whether they can safely watch films or not, or else all excitement is removed from life (echoes of the nanny state):

There are many sides to the same coin, some want a new age restriction, others do not, and you will not be much better off if you think about consequences all the time. But to have freedom, but not so much that it puts you and those around you in danger, but enough freedom creates a little exciting and varied life where you are free to make your own choices about which movie you should see and what not to see.

‘Alderssprik gir mareritt, eller ikke?’ Norwegian writing article, Girl, Grade 8

Hayward (2012: 106) writes about these ‘little’ issues of justice (immediate questions of fairness) that trouble children and young people. What we have to realise is that first, these are valid problems, although they may not be life-threatening or life-changing, and second, that addressing their problems by having to think through them from different perspectives is a starting point for young people to learn how to engage in issues beyond their own circle of interest. This is the development of *Bildung* thinking, and again there are strong similarities to Nussbaum’s model with its emphasis on personal freedoms and respect. ‘We should not ignore the fact that people’s choices differ, and that respect for people requires respecting the areas of freedom around them within which they make these choices’ (Nussbaum, 2011: 107).

In another article a student wrote about banning begging (*tiggerforbud*). He debates the ethics of allowing others to beg in Norway. One of his arguments was about humans having equal value,

beggars or not, 'I believe that we should try and put ourselves into their situation, and think about how we would feel if people ignored us and were nasty to us', again the *Bildung* idea of understanding an issue from perspectives other than our own. The first part of his article is written below:

In recent years, there have been only more and more beggars to Norway. Opposition to begging and beggars have held for a long time. In the 1600-1700's beggars were divided into two groups, the worthy and the unworthy. The worthy could once in a while get a sum of money, but the unworthy were punished and sometimes chased out of town. The old Vagrancy Act also differed between those who were worthy, and honourable, and those who were not. And you would rather have it the way we think today? That it is easier to give money until he/she sells some magazines, instead of people who sit and beg. Often beggars approach us and wield a cup while they ask for money. Or sit on the cold ground with a cup in their hand and a picture in front, usually of their children. For many, this feels uncomfortable, while some ignore them completely. Some turn away and try and get past as quickly as possible. Should we ban people from asking for help? It is these ethical issues that make it difficult for us to determine whether it should be banned or not. What should be defined as begging?

'Tiggerforbud' Norwegian writing article, Boy, Grade 8

Getting students to think about everyday situations and the 'Norwegian' response is frequently used by teachers to build students' understanding of how their country's democracy works and how to think about the rights and freedoms of the people who live there.

The parent also talked about how they saw fundraising theme weeks as developing critical thinking in students through having to explain their work to the parents:

So, these theme weeks are very effective for us as parents, to watch what they are doing in school, because apart from the homework, we cannot control anything. But then we are invited to school, to see what they are doing, and the children are there to present the work, we are there to ask the questions, and the teachers are there to back up [the children]. It is organised like that...so that is one way of teaching the children, of thinking and learning. I suppose it's about learning how to think, about having a critical mind. And of course, everyone is allowed to have their opinion.

Interview with parent representative, September 2013

The *Bildung* approach to leadership was also evident, an egalitarian and supportive way to lead others, rather than management from the top-down. The Principal talked about 'working with' the teachers to make changes, and how difficult that was:

As a principal, I find [the survey of student opinions] really useful, but when I take it to the level of the teachers and try to work with them, I feel resistance from them. It is a really difficult topic and difficult issue for the teachers.

Interview with Principal, March 2013

The principal saw his role as supporting the teachers, rather than hierarchical management telling the teachers what they had to change. But this is problematic because he has to convince them of

the positive value of change. This highlights the tensions that exist within Norwegian schools like those in many other Western countries, where there is pressure from government and a revised, more neoliberal, curriculum framework expecting teachers to 'perform' better (Ball, 2003, Stray, 2013). In Norway however, the principal and staff still follow a strongly egalitarian *Bildung* approach to management (Moos, 2003). Perhaps where this differs to other countries' experiences, like in England as described by Ball (2003), is that in Norway this resistance is more collectively-owned, as (probably nearly) all of the teachers have these values in common because of *Bildung* within their own education and traditional societal beliefs about freedoms and rights.

4.4.2 Participatory learning approaches

Print (2012) describes participatory learning approaches as including things like class voting, group inquiry, simulations, fieldwork and co-operative learning. In the Norwegian case study school, these approaches were somewhat in evidence. However, the teachers' interviews and observations suggest that while they are able to and do use a variety of participatory learning approaches in their teaching, they could use them more. In contrast, other education stakeholders interviewed in the case study believe that teachers are somewhat resistant to changing their teaching practice if they think it threatens their autonomy. The students interviewed would like to have different approaches used more, and more negotiation involved in how the curriculum is taught. Some students believe they learn better when they are allowed to contribute to decision-making.

The Religion/Ethics class teacher described an instance when she used class voting to teach a topic, with mixed results:

Sometimes [I ask what they think] and sometimes not. For example now in 10th grade I have two classes and we were going to talk about a new subject, the diversity of Christianity. I actually arranged a vote, and asked the class to choose between whether they wanted to do group work to deal with this issue or if they wanted the more traditional blackboard lecture style. In one class, the vote was for group work, and on the other class the vote was for more traditional work. But there weren't many votes that separated the decision so it was almost like 50-50 in both classes about who wanted group work and who wanted traditional style teaching. So then the groups that didn't get their way got kind of mad and I said yes well that's democracy, the majority get their way! [laughs]

Interview with Religion/Ethics teacher, May 2013

While this example provides a very limited view of democracy, it does help the students to understanding voting and how decisions are made from it. Having only a slightly smaller minority than the majority doesn't have any effect on the outcome. What would have been perhaps more valuable is if the teacher had then asked the class to make a decision using a more participatory approach such as deliberation, and see if at the end of it the class was still as divided about the outcome, or whether the discussion had changed their views or moderated the outcome in some way.

When asked about the kinds of classes they found most interesting, one student commented on how they liked more student-directed activities in classes, while another found watching movies more educational than teacher directed learning:

RESEARCHER: What are the most interesting things you have learned/done in class in learning about democracy/participation (in social studies or religion/ethics)?

BOY: When we've done things that are out of the ordinary, when it's not just the teacher speaking.

RESEARCHER: Do you have an example?

BOY 1: When we as students get to participate and have discussions among us.

GIRL 1: If you are talking about teaching methods, then I think it is a lot better to see films.

Interview with Grade 8 students, May 2013

The Social Studies teacher talked about the usefulness of field trips in terms of showing students experientially how democracy can operate in different social and cultural contexts, and help them to value what they have in their own democracy:

We don't get so much money each year to manage these things. But I think the tours [fieldtrips] are very important and I would like to have a good quality tour in 10th grade for every class, for example the 'White Bus' tour [the Norwegian White Buses Foundation organises visits to concentration camps for school classes, accompanied by first-hand witnesses and survivors]. Or maybe, although it's more expensive, go to Asia or Africa or look at countries [when] teaching pupils after or before the tour. And then you can travel to a place and learn more about it. And maybe we would see how spoilt we are by global standards.

So that's the best way to learn, I think, about democracy. Of course, it's important to use [things like] smartboards, interactive boards, and we can show videoclips – the speech from Hitler [for example], that's good...And of course that gives us possibilities but I think you have to go outside the classroom sometimes and that's a good thing. And if you prepare well before and after the tour you can get a lot out of the tour.

Interview with Social Studies teacher, May 2013

In terms of consultation determining the way in which students worked (the negotiated curriculum), both students and teachers commented on this. A student in Grade 10 gave an example of consultation, where a few years earlier the municipality had presented some different options for parents and teachers to think about, and this student's class had got involved in the process:

BOY 1: There was something about not wanting homework, so we [the class] chose that. So we tried to convince our parents that we didn't have to have any homework...[we spent] at least a few hours talking about it with the different parties.

RESEARCHER: What happened in the end?

BOY 1: That [option] didn't get chosen, so we got homework! [laughs]

RESEARCHER: Did they listen to your arguments?

BOY 1: Yeah, they did listen. [But] they thought about a lot more [other areas of consideration] than not having homework, so...

Interview with Grade 10 students, May 2013

This example shows much more effort in terms of developing a consultative approach with students. As a process, it respected the views of the students, but also required them to come up with good arguments for their case of no longer having homework. But the student who discussed it also realised that the parents had to consider a number of elements in making their decision, recognising that decision-making can involve multiple views and considerations. These are all valuable learnings for young people about a genuine process of democratic decision-making, even on a small issue (Hayward, 2012).

The teachers, on being asked about how much they consulted with their students, had mixed responses. One questioned the extent to which younger students were able to participate. Another felt that teacher –directed learning made it easier to cover the mandated curriculum. A problem that came up was when they asked students about their views but felt that the students weren't actually conscious that they had just participated in a process. The Norwegian/Religion teacher described the challenges of consultation:

I see a real difference between eighth grade and 10th grade, with 10th grade you can be more alert to these issues of student participation, because they know more about how they learn and they are more active in that process, whereas eighth graders don't really know. You remember to ask them from time to time, but of course when you're a busy teacher and you have to get through the curriculum [so] you just move on and don't always really listen to the students in that sense. But at the same time I also think that students are really participating in class and making decisions but they're not just conscious of 'actually now we just participated and we had our say in our teaching'.

We just had a talk among the staff about how we maybe need to make the students more conscious of the choices they are making and how they are actually contributing, because they might not always see it.

Interview with Norwegian/Religion teacher, May 2013

The Social Studies teacher thought that teachers at their school could do better to uphold the legislation on participation (*medvirkning*), not only related to how they teach but also planning blocks of work and tests:

We are not good enough, I think, on student participation. We do a lot of things but we could be better. For example, in how often we listen to the students - in questions related to the teaching, to the plans related to the teaching, to plans for tests, listen to the students. I think that for some teacher teams at this school it is okay, but for other teams they are not doing enough for students. If you have five big tests in a week and the next week none, something is wrong, because it will be a

nightmare week for students and you have to split up and put tests over a longer period, I think. And then we have to listen to the students. That's student participation.

Interview with Social Studies Teacher, May 2013

The principal agreed, and noted that the teachers don't always know how to teach in a democratic way, or have the time and energy to focus on doing so, because of perceived tension between developing content knowledge and learning processes. Consequently they resist the principal's efforts to encourage better practices:

I think it's really important that students are able to express when they learn best and how they learn best and in that way be able to participate in a democratic way. The teachers are usually very busy and not all of them have the time or energy to focus on these aspects of the learning but have to focus on the subject area per se, more than the learning processes and how the students experience them. So that's why I meet this resistance with the teachers. Because the teachers don't know how to adapt these democratic aims to their own subject and their own teaching.

Interview with Principal, March 2013

The principal then describes the ways in which he lets his students make decisions about how they learn in the classes he teaches, and strongly agrees that there are benefits:

PRINCIPAL: I teach [subject], and as a teacher I want to spend time in the classroom teaching [subject] to the students and engaging with them. I can ask the students if they want to work individually or in pairs or in groups, that's something that I can do in my own classroom. I can ask them if they want to have a spoken presentation or hand in a written document. But I can't discuss the content of the subject itself because that's directed by the curriculum...

RESEARCHER: Do you think though, from personal experience, you get better learning out of your students if you listen to *how* they want to be taught?

PRINCIPAL: Definitely! [laughs] But it's very easy for me to say that, but it's more difficult to practice it.

Interview with Principal, March 2013

Some of the feedback from the student interviews was that they didn't always feel listened to by the teachers. The students in Grade 8 were able to give some examples though, of where things had been changed because of their requests. They were also divided though, about whether their views should be considered:

RESEARCHER: Are you involved in making decisions in class with your teachers about planning the lessons or how you work or the way your work is assessed? How much involvement do you have?

- BOY 1: I don't feel that we get to participate a lot in these issues, that the teacher decides everything.
- GIRL 1: It kind of depends on the teacher, but no, we don't get to decide that much.
- BOY 2: No, it's quite rare, but for example in science we got to complain that we didn't have enough lab time, so then we got that once we made a complaint.
- GIRL 2: No we don't get to decide that much, but for example in music we get to decide if we do theory or band or musical instruments.
- BOY 1: The teacher listens to what we say, but if they have already made up their mind, they don't do anything about it.
- RESEARCHER: Do you think that it is important that students contribute to decision making in the school?
- BOY 1: No, I actually don't think it's that important that students participate in decision-making because the teachers know best how to do things.
- GIRL 1: I think it's important in relation to tests, because often teachers can put tests close together, and so students can ask that they be spread out.
- BOY 2: I kind of disagree with Boy 1, because students actually know a lot about how they learn and what they are interested in, and teachers should know that, and be open to that.
- GIRL 2: I think we should have more to say, especially about how things are done, but I think teachers should have a lot of say in what [topics] we work with, because they know what is coming ahead, for example.

Interview with Grade 8 students, May 2013

The education official thought that these kinds of issues of consultation between students and teachers were very common for this age group, but also suggested that language differences might explain why students might not think they were being consulted with very often when they were:

I think it's very typical that situation [students not feeling listened to] you just described. I think its part of being a teenager as well. Because teachers (and the *Kommune*) create expectations among young people and say that you will be able to participate and so on, but it's also that the pupils don't always register when they are actually participating in democratic processes. Like you said, we often don't go back to them to say "yes your voice has been heard, and we have changed this because of what you said". So it's an issue of communication, and also that we don't use the same words as say the national curriculum or the national student survey. A very specific example from the national survey is "are you participating in x [topic] at school?" Whereas in Trøndersk [local dialect] they [the

teachers] would say “now you’re planning with us”, so use more everyday words. Maybe that makes them [the pupils], confused and think that they don’t have a lot of influence.

Interview with Education official, September 2013

She also noted that participatory learning in school went across many grades, including from kindergarten level, mentioning a project with children in *barnehagen* (kindergarten):

We have also been concerned with how we consult with younger children, and we have had a big project going on for many years in the child development area called ‘*Barnsmedveknning*’ [children’s participation]. And we are asking them too much about their opinion! [laughs]
“Do you want the red or the blue sweater?”

Interview with Education official, September 2013

This comment, while light-hearted and offering a fairly simplistic choice, suggests that encouraging participation by students is a process that develops across many years during a students’ time at kindergarten, primary school and high school. The principal also supported this view, indicating that the range and level of ability to participate increased as students became older and developed their ability to think more deeply:

When you talk about democratic activities and processes, I think that it is age-appropriate between 10 and 12 [years] to start contributing with their own opinions. But students here, 15-16 years old, they can contribute a lot, in different areas.

Interview with Principal, March 2013

In summary, the area of participatory learning leaves wide scope for ways in which teachers can engage students in learning and develop their democratic skills in doing so. In the Norwegian case study school, there was evidence of these approaches, and they were generally enthusiastically received by students. But it appears that there is room for them to be used more widely, and for teachers to see the benefits of students taking more control of their own learning.

4.4.3 Practising deliberation

Practices of deliberation, including discussion and dialogue, controversial topics, and storytelling all appear to be a strength in the case study school, and probably more widely in the Norwegian education system. This next section discusses the findings in each of these areas in more detail.

Discussion and dialogue

The Norwegian teacher appears and briskly motions me and my interpreter to join her on her way to class, smiling a welcome and rapid-firing an explanation of the morning in Norwegian. We walk through the canteen hall set out with tables on our way through to the classroom. Open-plan schools became popular from about the seventies onwards in Norway, and this school is no exception, with our ‘class’ being in one half of a large, long room partially divided by a stack of lockers at the halfway point. The teacher introduces us as we sit down at the back of the class, and after reading the class roll wastes no time getting into the discussion for the day. The students are to

write an editorial-style article that presents different opinions on a current controversial topic, and today's class is entirely discussion-based, focusing on the kinds of topics that they might write about. The students, after a few glances back at us, lean forward and join in the conversation. They are involved, interested and interesting, and talk for an hour and a half (with a five minute break in the middle) about a whole range of subjects, from 'what is freedom?' to definitions of citizenship to conditions in old people's homes, euthanasia, and finally, suicide and why people might want to take their own life (Norwegian class observation, May 2013).

The class observations were mostly based around discussion topics, as I had requested observing these, and they were certainly participated in enthusiastically by both the teachers and students. Discussion is not confined to topic material in the class though. Students were also able to describe how teachers engage them in decision-making about how they are taught, although they and the teachers agreed that they could do more in this area (as noted in the section above on participatory learning). The principal also reflected on ways he could enable the staff to work with the students more. Accepting discussion as a natural part of decision-making seems to be drawn from the high value placed on democracy in Norwegian society. School is seen as a logical place to learn how to participate by practising discussion skills.

The official, when questioned about whether this school was a typical Norwegian school in that students participated in discussion in class regularly, agreed:

RESEARCHER: It seems to me like in Norwegian schools [everyone] talks a lot! Would that be true across all schools?

OFFICIAL: Yes, I think it's a way of teaching, of involving the pupils in the learning process.

RESEARCHER: The students said that they enjoyed those classes much more than when they were being talked to.

OFFICIAL: Yes, the students are always telling us that!

Interview with Education Official, September 2013

I raised the subject of discussion and debate with the professor as well - that I thought there was quite a lot of this being practised in classrooms. He cautioned that there are two kinds of approaches that Norwegian teachers often take. The first is what he called a 'word game', where the teachers ask questions and the students answer, but these are more association-type questions with expected answers rather than open-ended discussion (also noted by McGee, 1997). The second approach was the more open-ended question where the teacher is asking for opinions and debate on a topic, but he thought this was less commonly used (see the controversial topics section for examples). Both approaches were observed in the case study school, but usually a mix of both was used during the class sessions.

A classic word game approach was evident in one of the Religion/Ethics Grade 8 classes observed. The students were having a discussion about 'What is happiness?' based on previous learning about

different religions and their views on what brings happiness to people. In this excerpt, the teacher is clearly checking and reinforcing their knowledge of Buddhism as she asks them about Nirvana:

TEACHER: But why do we ask about happiness when we talk about Buddhism?

STUDENT: Because they are happy about what they get.

[students all start talking]

TEACHER: First this student...one at a time...

STUDENT: Buddhists have a different kind of happiness than we do.

TEACHER: So the happiness of Buddhism is to break the cycle of rebirth [samsara]? Do other religions do that?

STUDENT: No, no other religions do that.

TEACHER: I think you're missing the point here. What's 'samsara'?

STUDENT: 'Nirvana'.

TEACHER: What's 'Nirvana'?

[Students put their hands up]

STUDENT: Nirvana is a level that you reach when you break 'samsara'.

TEACHER: Benjamin, what do you say?

BENJAMIN: It's heaven.

TEACHER: Heaven. Annette?

ANNETTE: It's a condition, not a place.

TEACHER: [repeating for the rest of the class] It's more like a condition that you're in, says the girl at the back here. What's a condition?

EINAR: It's a level you're in or a condition where you are happy.

STUDENT: It's a place of salvation.

Grade 8B Religion/Ethics class, May 2013

Communicating knowledge about topics is a necessary part of teaching the curriculum. However, from the excerpt above we can see that while there has been a certain amount of knowledge instruction in previous classes (about Buddhism), the focus of the observed class was to get the students to engage with the material they had learned. This teacher recognises that students are more likely to retain knowledge if they are encouraged to think about how their lives relate to it (through using their sociological imaginations, Barnes et al., 1999). They are also challenged to think about the merits of the Buddhist approach versus other ways of looking at happiness. In this way, the teacher shows that critical thinking (*Bildung*) is central to learning to deliberate well, with reasoned arguments, rather than viewing students as empty vessels to be filled with information that they simply repeat back.

Controversial topics

Topics that might be seen as controversial in other countries are encouraged to be discussed in school in Norway. As the social studies teacher put it: ‘...but then an important part of Norwegian democracy is that we talk about everything’ (Interview with Social Studies teacher, May 2013). It’s not surprising either, when you look at the required outcomes for Social Studies by the end of Grade 10. Some of the level of knowledge expected is quite explicit, for example:

- provide examples of how beliefs about the relationship between love and sexuality can vary within and between cultures;
- analyze gender roles in portrayals of sexuality and explain the difference between desired sexual contact and sexual assault.

Utdanningsdirektoratet (2013a: 1)

These kinds of topics also explain the same teacher’s comments regarding being aware of the background of the students they have, when he said that:

All in all we can talk about most things without a problem. It’s more difficult if you come to sexuality, and you have students who have been sexually abused, and then you have to think before you talk about anything. All in all I will say that we can speak about most of the things in society, and I think that’s important.

Interview with Social Studies teacher, May 2013

Because very few subjects are sacred or off-limits within the classroom, parents expect this and will also discuss a wide range of topics at home (Schulz et al., 2010). It’s also evidenced in Norwegian children’s fiction books that discuss things like sexuality and bodies and death with quite frank detail from a young age. As a result there is very little reaction from parents to this, as the social studies teacher explains:

TEACHER: In 20 years I have never had a phone call or mail from parents about the subjects we are teaching. So maybe that’s a good sign.

RESEARCHER: Because the students talk about it at home, probably?

TEACHER: Yes they do.

Interview with Social Studies Teacher, May 2013

The education official agreed. When I explained to her some of the topics I had observed being discussed in a lesson (freedom, old people in nursing homes, euthanasia) and asked if that was normal, her response was, 'I hope they have! I think it's quite usual to have discussions about actual political issues.' The parent was equally accepting, although he did acknowledge that he had worked as a teacher in the past so knew what to expect. Norwegians seem to have quite a mature, robust way of dealing with sensitive issues and topics, which was reflected in the kind of wide-ranging discussions I observed the students having at (what I considered to be) quite a young age (13-14 years).

The students observed how much they enjoyed these discussions, and the opportunities it gave them to hear other's views on controversial issues like abortion and euthanasia:

RESEARCHER: At school, what are the most interesting things you have learned/done in your classes in learning about democracy/participation (in social studies or religion/ethics)?

BERIT: We haven't really worked specifically on democracy, or the environment, it's been kind of a general term that's been combined with other themes. Like in social studies we often have homework to find news articles and to discuss what's happening in the news and then democracy can be an issue as part of that, how we see different countries deal with democracy in different ways, and we've had this project where you choose a third world country and then you discover the political structures and so on in that country. So it's good to work on those issues in groups but also to go more in-depth on your own.

INGRID: Yes, like in religion, we quite recently had discussions about abortion and euthanasia and that makes people more conscious.

BERIT: I really like discussions as well in class, where you can hear other student's opinions.

Grade 10 Political Club Members, May 2013

One interesting observation came from the Norwegian class, who were discussing a range of topics to write about. They turned to the conditions in residential homes for the elderly, which has caused some controversy in Norway recently. This section of the transcript highlights several things of note. First, the teacher talks about old people wearing 'diapers' or continence pads, the kind of topic that in New Zealand classrooms students would giggle about when mentioned. In observing this part of the lesson, I didn't see a single student smile – they were all serious and engaged in a subject they clearly found interesting. Second, the student who partway through says he needs to 'attack back', is trying to give an opposing, or 'devil's advocate' view. While he also issues a disclaimer that he doesn't necessarily agree with the viewpoint he is putting forward, he obviously understands the

importance of sharing contradictory and even unpopular views with the class. The fact he does this also means that the class is a safe place to share differences of opinion, and to see how your peers react. The teacher also explains that they will discuss some of these topics in Grade 10, but still also expands a little so they can, even now, start to understand what the debate is about:

TEACHER: We are talking about the treatment they get in a hospital not in a senior home or a jail, not how they feel, as they are guilty or feel alone, we should stick to the issue of how they get treated.

STUDENT: I saw something on TV where a man in a rest home was too scared to push the emergency button or even ask for help because he knew there was only one person available and she was really busy, he didn't want to take up her time.

TEACHER: [Talking about how old people often have to wear diapers (incontinence pads)] because if you have dementia or you get sick so you can't always control your bladder. How long should you have to wear that diaper?

TEACHER: So, the old people aren't really being treated that well.

STUDENT [boy]: The reason why the treatment is bad is because there are more and more old people, and we live too well, and we just get very very old, so that[numbers of] old people pile up. So when you get more and more old people, it becomes a problem. People can live until they are hundred, so of course the treatment is worse in the senior home because there are so many old people.

TEACHER: So now I'm going to say my opinion in this case. This is the case, that there are more and more old people, because their level of wealth just increases and we have a really good life. So then it's really important that people in your generation become nurses so that you can take care of all the old people! That means we need more nurses to be able to handle the situation.

STUDENT [boy]: So now I need to 'attack back' [provide a counter-argument]!

TEACHER: Okay hold on, hold on. So now I'm going to do something different...

STUDENT [boy from above]: So maybe this is selfish and stupid, and I'm not really agreeing with myself when I say it, but we live way too long. And old people, they want to die. And they should really die earlier, in my opinion!

[The class erupts with students yelling, laughing etc.]

STUDENT [boy, continued]: Most old people don't really do anything they just lie in the rest home and do the same thing every, every, every, day.

[Other students start arguing with him]

TEACHER: [waits for students to calm down] When we get to 10th grade, there is a chapter in the religion textbook where you can discuss ethical dilemmas. And an ethical dilemma is about those difficult choices such as with old people, if you should help someone to die, euthanasia. There are actually people in our society who want to make a law that makes it possible to help people to die when they are in pain and they are really old. And that's a really intense discussion today, and there are strong opinions on both sides and it's not only about age, it's also about lifelong diseases, chronic diseases.

Grade 8 Norwegian class observation, May 2013

The teacher noted after the class though, that this group of students was more likely to have these kinds of discussion than her other Grade 8 class. She also makes the interesting observation that the quality of the discussion is not necessarily related to intellect:

TEACHER: It's not like that every lesson of course, the discussion [we had today]. But when you're having a discussion, this class can be like that [really engaged]. They're not afraid about telling, about grandparents, about family, they're not ashamed about anything. I think they feel safe and secure in the class. They are comfortable with their friends and everything. The other class of mine is not like that.

RESEARCHER: Why is that do you think?

TEACHER: I don't know. That's a question I always ask, because how can that be? There are pupils from three different schools near here, and it's the same [they are equally split] in both classes. So why it's like that, we don't know. But when you go to writing papers or doing maths, the other class achieves better. There are more pupils there that have higher grades. But in this class we have three from other countries [speakers of other languages], then they have a problem with Norwegian reading and writing so hmm. It's nothing to do with smart or not smart, it's more like personality, and they have opinions and they dare to say them. And they can disagree and then they can be friends [again].

Follow-up interview, Norwegian teacher, May 2013

At the end of this comment, where the teacher says the students 'can disagree and then they can be friends', it is an important observation about developing skills to present differing views. The teacher is noting that students can discuss controversial (and sometimes highly emotive) topics, learning that they can disagree while still remaining friends, so that the friendship is not displaced by the argument. This fits with Mouffe's (2005) idea of agonism as politics that involves living with real differences, in contrast to a number of her deliberative contemporaries who would rather work towards consensus.

The Norwegian teacher also talked about how she had used the highly political problem of begging as a learning opportunity for the students in her Grade 8 class:

In Norwegian classes we've actually focused on students writing their opinions, in different ways. So we've done that quite a lot recently. And we've talked a lot about beggars, people from Romania and so on. So we have talked, and that links up with direct action as well. So it's really about writing and expressing themselves in writing, but indirectly that means expressing political opinions.

Interview with Norwegian teacher, May 2013

Here is evidence that this teacher, at least, is trying to engage students in the issues that are challenging to Norwegians. Begging, because it is primarily a problem with Romanians coming to the country, also carries questions of citizenship (should people have the right to beg in another European country?) and multiculturalism (are all Romanians like this?). These are ways in which conversations about controversial political issues can be opened for discussion with the students.

Storytelling

Storytelling can be a key way of engaging young people in deliberation. Observing the class discussions in Norwegian and Religion/Ethics, I was impressed with how engaged the students were in the classes, even when the discussions went on for some time. In transcribing the observations however, I noticed an interesting pattern. The teacher would every now and then tell a story about something. Some of the stories were personal, others about current events. These stories would engage the students again each time, keeping them actively listening throughout the class. This teacher also has a wonderful way of painting pictures with words, which help the students to imagine different situations and feelings beyond their own experiences. The teacher sharing on a personal level also allows the students to share their stories, if they choose, sometimes highlighting diverse experiences.

The first transcript is when the students are talking about the Norwegian national day (17 May) and why they celebrate on that day, while during the second (later on during the same lesson), they talk about what being a Norwegian citizen means. The teacher tells stories, some of them personal, in each situation. In the first excerpt she talks about her grandparents, and about her and her husband having a conversation. In the second, it's about her involvement with a student gaining Norwegian citizenship. She draws the students into the discussion so that they then want to share their own stories or ask relevant questions:

EXCERPT 1:

STUDENT 1: So [leading up to WWII] Hitler motivated the Germans, and they were so poor at that time, and he had a gift of speech that really fascinated people.

STUDENT 2: I think they handed out candy so that people would like them.

TEACHER: [During the German occupation of Norway] my grandmother had Germans living at their house because they were teachers, and so the Germans lived at their house. And he cried...one of the soldiers cried and talked about his mother and his wife

and children. He didn't want to be in the war, he wanted to go back to his family but he wasn't allowed to because he had to fight in the war. So they were forced to be in the Army, the German forces.

STUDENT 3: My great-grandfather, he has written a lot about the war years and how their whole house was occupied by Germans with dogs, who bit my great-grandfather. And in the houses around, there were lots of German soldiers.

TEACHER: What do you think it was like on 17 May 1945 in Norway? Now we've talked about that we celebrate the day of our Constitution, 17 May, ever since you were born, out in the parade, yell hurray, eat ice cream, hot dogs, candy and [get] balloons.

What do you think 17 May 1945 was like? Me and my husband talked about it the other day, what if we could travel in time, get in a helicopter and go back in time, which day would you have liked to visit? And my husband said I think I would have liked to go back to 17 May 1945 to experience what it would have been like celebrating that day, after Norway had been five years in the war. Some of you have talked about your grandparents how they had been in prison, couldn't do this, and couldn't do that and to travel away from their families. And then after five years the war ends. Because Germany had occupied Norway, the Norwegian flag wasn't able to be seen [during the occupation], you were punished if you took it out, the Norwegian flag, because that meant hurray for Norway, and Hitler wanted to have a gigantic German Empire. What do you think it was like, that 17th of May?

STUDENT 4: How many had a flag?

TEACHER: Oh I'll tell you, they found them! If they didn't have them, they probably made them.

STUDENT 4: Don't you think they were afraid that the war would start again?

TEACHER: If you see old films, you see how many people were in the streets at that time. That 17th of May, was an amazing day, because you saw in so many ways, freedom, democracy, equality and brotherhood, and freedom of religion, all these things...even though if you were a farmer, or an aristocrat, whatever part of society you came from, you were equal.

So the Norwegian flag is always at the top [flying] on 8 May because it reminds us of freedom.

The second excerpt is interesting because it illuminates the way the teacher also weaves in an understanding of what it means to be a Norwegian citizen. Drawing on a personal story of a family's joy at becoming citizens helps these (mostly ethnic) Norwegian students to gain a different perspective. The teacher summarises by saying that citizenship is about having a Norwegian passport, yet a student then also points out that Norwegians can be someone who does something

for Norwegian society. The teacher agrees. These examples show how stories can reflect important political questions and understandings (Barnes et al., 1999), with a view of citizenship more about belonging to the collective and contributing to the social good rather than a purely bureaucratic form:

EXCERPT 2

STUDENT: What is Norwegian citizenship? Is it having a Norwegian passport? What about the right to reside in Norway?

TEACHER: Some years ago, I went down to the police station with a student, because she was going to get her citizenship, she was going to get a paper that said she was Norwegian. And that was such a great joy in that family. She was there with her parents and siblings in that family; it was a big thing, because now they would get their citizenship. They had been so looking forward to becoming Norwegian. More people in the family then got their citizenship, but that is confidential so I can't tell you who that family was or where they are from, it was stamped with kind of a secret or private issue. So getting a Norwegian citizenship means you get a Norwegian passport among other things. So you can travel around the world as a Norwegian with a Norwegian passport. So you need to have been living in Norway for five years to get that citizenship. And when you get that you are Norwegian by definition.

STUDENT: One more thing, a Norwegian is someone who does something for the Norwegian society.

TEACHER: You can say that too.

Grade 8 Norwegian class observation, May 2013

In both excerpts a theme that comes through powerfully is how views of citizenship change depending on your experiences. With the war occupation still fairly recent history in Norway, the teacher is making the point for the students that we value our freedoms more if they have been taken from us. This situation also applies in the second excerpt for the migrant family, as receiving Norwegian citizenship gave them new freedoms to live there and travel with the protection of the Norwegian government in the future.

4.4.4 Relationships between teachers and students

As the diminutive, experienced teacher makes her way into the classroom of Grade 8 students, she pokes and heckles them in a way that amazes me (used as I am to a more New Zealand 'hands-off' approach from teachers to students). "Where are you going now? What are you doing?" But she does it in a way that, while direct, is equally motherly, and the students clearly enjoy her attention, eagerly huddling around her even as she tells them off. Her no-nonsense but caring interactions extend to the way she teaches in the classroom, and she encourages her students to listen and act considerately as they express their views in class. In the discussion observed in the Grade 8

Religion/Ethics class, she notes the importance of relationships, and models them herself during a class discussion on happiness by telling one of the students how nice it is that she acknowledges the teacher every day:

STUDENTS: What makes *you* [the teacher] happy??

TEACHER: I am happy when I see Amanda [points to a student in the class], because she has this great ability to see the people around her and she makes me genuinely happy every day when she says [mimics happy tone] 'Hi [teacher]!'

[The students laugh]

TEACHER: Being seen, acknowledged by other people is really important. Don't you all agree with me?

Grade 8B Religion/Ethics class observation, May 2013

In the class observations, the teachers often used religion and ethics to frame the way that students are encouraged to talk about their views, in a way that respects others and considers multiple perspectives and opinions (links both to *Bildung* and Nussbaum's model). The professor talked about what aspects needed to be considered when preparing to have these kinds of conversations in the class, making connections with *Bildung* through his references to showing respect, listening and personalising the conversation:

PROFESSOR: Teachers need to be given some frameworks for handling the conversation in class. There need to be some [guidelines], and this [is not always very talked about] in classrooms...

RESEARCHER: When you are teaching future teachers, what kind of frameworks are you giving them?

PROFESSOR: [quoting what he would say to teachers] "You need to tell the truth, you need to be sincere, you need to listen to other people, you need to personalise it. The point is to argue, and you need to show respect for others." There need to be some sort of, basic interpersonal rules. And I think the school should work these out...and with this kind of framework the teachers need to have some kind of contract with their students, actually saying this is how the conversation is going to go, and if you break the rules, you are offending others. Everyone should be respected.

The professor then continues by discussing how, in spite of having rules, deliberation can still be hard to negotiate well, depending on the topic and the students in the class:

PROFESSOR: And still there are of course issues. If there is one hijab [scarf-wearing Muslim] girl in the class, and you address the issue, 'should hijab be in school?' I mean, you have a very delicate problem as a teacher, because it's obvious who will feel

offended by this. Another thing is if the girl herself brings up the issue. But it still is very difficult you know. So you don't solve all the problems with having those rules, you can still run into delicate decisions you have to make, but we're just human.

Interview with professor, September 2013

Like the professor, in terms of relating to the students the Norwegian/Religion teacher talked about the problem of them recently saying things like 'black awful Muslims'. She was very clear about the boundaries students needed to learn in order to participate in a positive way. She noted that sometimes it was far better to redirect the discussion rather than just telling students it was wrong to talk negatively about others. In an example of a discussion about begging, the teacher wanted to make the students think about peoples' rights under the Constitution, and what freedom, equality and brotherhood mean for all, including beggars:

TEACHER: I had thought to talk a bit more about who is Norwegian, because the other class were like 'Oh these black awful Muslims' [but in class today] it didn't come up. Because there are black people in the class too. But in the other class, there are no black people.

RESEARCHER: That's interesting.

TEACHER: But there was no discussion [about that today], they had other opinions [to share]. You can hear where they have also listened to their parents. I thought also [to talk] about beggars.

RESEARCHER: Because that's a real issue.

TEACHER: Yes, and the Roma people [coming to beg in Norway]. They [the students] listen at home, and you can hear the grown-ups' opinions, but they don't know anything about it, and I think as a teacher I would have corrected them and said something, not say that it is wrong, but say something about freedom, equality, and brotherhood, from the French [Revolution], and about human rights from the Constitution, freedom of religion and speech. Because I wouldn't allow anyone in my class to say anything [rascist]. They [the police] are very strict...then they arrest them. Because that's not allowed in Norway. They shall have the freedom to live. So that kind of opinion, you don't, are not allowed. So that's not democracy! [laughs] But that's why I think it's in the Constitution of Norway, also. So racism, I say 'No'. Democracy yes, but to a certain point, in a way. They are not allowed to say anything that would hurt another in the class. Because they don't know everything about each other, you don't know why people are coming to Norway...So we have to be careful also, when you let them speak...But it's a very fun class, it's more exciting to go into this class because you don't always know what will come up, but in the other class it's more like, they are not so surprising. They don't surprise me. This class, they can surprise.

Interview with Norwegian/Religion teacher, May 2013

As the teacher clearly notes, there are limits to where controversial discussions can go, because of the country's laws on racist speech. The teacher has a difficult role to steer students carefully through the discussion. They need opportunities to express what they think yet be encouraged to use better language and think about others' differences in positive ways. If teachers always negatively criticise when students make mistakes, that would diminish mutual trust and respect, a sense of *Bildung* that can also be seen in the English philosopher Peters' view of the teacher and students together sharing experiences in a shared world (Varkøy, 2010).

The teacher also notes that as well as rules, an important part of developing good classroom discussions is building relationships with the students as she learns more about them over time, as the rest of the interview demonstrates:

INTERPRETER: And they give something back?

TEACHER: All the time. It's more difficult with the other class...perhaps they hear their opinions out in the break or something afterwards, yeah, I don't know. I'm going to find out during these three years!

RESEARCHER: Do you see that over time that they change? When you're with them for that long?

TEACHER: Yes, yes.

RESEARCHER: You get to know them very well I guess?

TEACHER: Yes. I'm starting to [laughs].

Interview with Norwegian/Religion teacher, May 2013

The education official summarised the relationship and rules best, saying it was about the classroom atmosphere, the rules the teacher had established so everyone is motivated to work together in a way that is respectful and 'safe':

It's important that the class has a good atmosphere, that there is a good level of cooperation between the teacher and the students, so that the teacher is safe, or more able to open the discussion about controversial topics. There has to be some kind of agreement between the teacher and the students on how it will work.

Another hot topic these days is the student-teacher relationship, how they relate to one another in school, and I think that teachers who work in *ungdomsskolen* are usually quite good at that. That's why they work there because they like communicating with young people and that's part of why they want to work there.

And the teachers will know which classes they can have that kind of discussion in and how far the conversation can safely go.

Interview with education official, September 2013

In summing up this section of the findings, it is interesting to observe how much *Bildung* is interwoven into the ways that democracy is practiced within the formal curriculum, through participatory learning, practising deliberation (including discussion, controversial topics and storytelling), and in the way teachers build relationships with their students. While this is very much a model of rational autonomy, focused on the individual-as-citizen, these experiences do teach young people a number of very practical and real skills for participating both now and in the future as citizens.

4.5 FINDINGS 3. HOW IS DEMOCRACY PRACTISED IN THE INFORMAL CURRICULUM?

In this third section of the findings, I explored how democracy was practised within the informal curriculum. The kinds of activities included here, which Print (2012) divides into instrumental (those which are more likely to create active citizens) and expressive (other social activities, which may not have such significant effects but still contribute) are in the Norwegian school a mix of required and optional. Pupil council work is a requirement, while standing as a representative on the student council is not, however, the ICCS study showed that a high proportion of students become representatives during their time at school (Schulz et al., 2010). Students can also be part of the *FAU*, as representatives of student and parent views when addressing problems or issues relevant to the student body. Theme weeks are another good way to involve the whole school in a fundraising effort for charity, with all students involved in preparation as part of various class activities and demonstrating their learning to parents at the end. Political clubs are optional, but in the case study school were supported by the staff both tangibly (money for attending conferences) and intangibly (allowed to fundraise or promote the club within the school). Many students also participate in other social activities, in particular learning a musical instrument or belonging to a choir through the municipality culture school, or as a member of a sports association (these are all activities offered outside of school).

4.5.1 The Student Council

There is an emphasis in Norwegian schools on students experiencing democratic processes while at school. In the case study *ungdomsskole* up until the end of the 2013/14 school year they held class meetings once a week (*elevrådsarbeid*) (as discussed in Chapter 3). Although this time has been replaced with electives on a range of topics, including one on democracy, the Social Studies teacher noted that these meetings will still continue but have to be squeezed into other class time.

All *ungdomsskolen* are legally required to have a student council (*elevråd*). In the case study school, two student representatives were elected from each class (not just from each year level). They meet every second week. The leadership of the council comprises three students (known as *ledertroika*). The social studies teacher interviewed was also the support teacher for the council, attending council meetings and giving guidance where needed. One of the teachers mentioned at least one decision the student council had made: 'for example they have this coffee machine now that they initiated that they wanted to have' (Interview with Norwegian/Religion teacher, May 2013).

In the student council meeting I observed, while much of the money raised during that year's 'theme week' was allocated to a major charity, there was a certain amount of money left over, and the students had to decide how it would be spent.

When asked about their effectiveness as representatives though, the students were somewhat dissatisfied:

RESEARCHER: In the student council, do you see changes there when you bring things?

BOY 2: Sometimes, but it also happens that nothing changes.

BOY 1: No, I can't really think of any specific cases where our voices have contributed to the change.

GIRL 1: For example, they haven't changed the mirrors down in the changing rooms, they are really weird so your head gets really big and your body small and it doesn't really work!

BOY 1: That case has been going on for a long time, since autumn really [nearly the whole school year].

Interview with Grade 8 students, May 2013

In this situation there did not appear to have been an adequate response from the staff as to their decision, so the students were left with the perception that their request for change was not heard or simply ignored. The professor also raised the point that the student council is not seen as a place to address matters relating to teaching. While students are participating in some decision making within the school, it is perhaps not in the areas that matter the most (like teaching):

It has been widely accepted that the student council should have nothing to do with teaching. So the student council is [points away] out here. Teaching is here [points in front of him], teaching is what matters. Every day, every lesson. And you go to the student council and it's about [making decisions about] sports, about Coke...

Interview with professor, September 2013

However when asked about effective ways to involve students in democratic decision making at school, the principal gave the example of a building project in the school a few years earlier. He had taken the opportunity to involve the students in a real-world process where they were contributing their views and ideas to the project in a democratic way, which proved to be very effective:

We had a working group that consisted of students and teachers and leaders at the school. They could discuss, together with engineers and architects and the local council, how the [project] was going to look. A couple of representatives in this group represented the student Council, so they had a back and forth process where they could bring propositions to the Council, so they could discuss how they wanted changing rooms or teaching areas to look, and they could bring that back to the architect and the engineers. And that was quite an advanced approach to doing things democratically, and used realistic situations. It was very effective.

Interview with Principal, March 2013

As this case study shows, while the student council is a legislated body, its effectiveness is really determined by the school it is situated within (i.e. the decisions of the principal and staff). If the school leaders choose to involve students in meaningful decision-making about how the school is run, then becoming a member of the council can be a valuable learning experience in terms of participation and democratic process for the students. If this is not the case, then there would still appear to be some useful learning opportunities through the experience of being a council member and following council processes to make decisions and act on them, and see the wider implications

within the school, even if that is just deciding to purchase a coffee machine for the benefit of the students.

4.5.2 Theme weeks

A number of the interviewees spoke of the value of 'theme weeks' that the school runs. It serves a number of useful purposes: it is used as an educational tool, a fundraising campaign and an opportunity for parents to see what is happening at the school. The theme is often based around a charity organisation, and the money raised goes to support them. This can often be a significant sum, the last campaign raised more than NOK 50,000 (over NZ \$7,000).

PRINCIPAL: We have a campaign every year, where we want to do something for somebody else, it's a whole week. This past year was Amnesty International...we choose which organisation will receive the money we raise within that week...it involves practical work, making products, we invite parents, siblings, grandparents, each year. So through the parents, they earn a lot of money.

RESEARCHER: Okay. So which subject is that included in?

PRINCIPAL: All subjects contribute. Some students make food in the school kitchen, others make artefacts [objects] in the arts and crafts department that they can sell, and small bird houses are really popular! Also glass jewellery. And some people are engaged with doing physical performances of some kind, with gymnastics or dancing.

RESEARCHER: So do you have some kind of concert for parents to come to?

PRINCIPAL: Yes, more an open school where then you have activities all over the school, every floor, and every classroom. And we have a performance on the stage in the hall.

RESEARCHER: So do you think students are much more interested in those organisations as a result of this?

PRINCIPAL: Yes. I think it really stimulates activity and interest in these organisations.

Interview with the Principal, March 2013

The parent representative was also enthusiastic about the value of 'theme weeks' and expressed their enthusiasm for one from a couple of years earlier, and its value as a learning tool:

One small story, they had pollution as a theme two years ago. At the end of the week they invited all the parents to come to the school, because they have to do something visible, they have to produce something. At the end of the week they invited all the parents to come to the school and watch the work, and it was magnificent, great work at all levels and in all classes. And we bought a painting that is still hanging on our wall back home. It is like, from here to the window [gestures to show a painting of quite a long shape and size] it is a fantastic painting that the children have produced. From

one side to the other some sort of journey from a clean society [at one end] and it is getting darker and darker [laughs] at the left side. It's some sort of dark society where nothing lives and everything is dead. So, these theme weeks are very effective for us as parents, to watch what they are doing in school, because apart from the homework, we cannot control anything. But then we are invited to school, to see what they are doing, and the children are there to present the work, we are there to ask the questions, and the teachers are there to back up [the children]. It is organised like that...so that is one way of teaching the children, of thinking and learning. I suppose it's about learning how to think, about having a critical mind. And of course, everyone is allowed to have their opinion.

Interview with Parent Representative, September 2013

Participation in society through volunteering and fund-raising are quite popular activities in Norway so it is hardly surprising that these aspects are harnessed within the case study school as a useful way of teaching students about contributing to wider causes. However, while this could be a fairly undemanding activity in its simplest form, here the school has employed students' imagination and creativity towards the task and helped them to engage with the learning material, often around issues of social justice, as they explain their work to the parents.

4.5.3 Political clubs

I interviewed two grade 10 students from a political club at the school. They talked about how they had re-started the club after it had stopped a year earlier. They were supported to start it up by the principal, who used some school funds to pay for two club members to attend a wider conference of the group in Oslo. The students realised as they worked to re-establish their local group within the school that they need to inform themselves about the issues and take on leadership roles to encourage others to join and participate. They said:

BERIT: ...when I became a leader of the group I had to set an agenda for the group, I had to be informed about different cases going on.

INGRID: ...you have a responsibility as part of the group to be informed about what's happening. [You look] silly and [it's] embarrassing if you are not informed and if you are not aware of what's going on.

Interview with Grade 10 political club representatives, May 2013

If students want to become involved in political experiences during their time at school, there are avenues to do so, and this applies to other Norwegian schools as well (Interview with Education official, September 2013). However, while individual students may be motivated enough to develop projects or lead others themselves, they are more likely to grow in their democratic experiences with the support of staff within the school. That the principal contributed school funds towards two students to attend a conference means he (and by extension, the school) acknowledges the students' work as valuable, and that developing their democratic skills (through participatory learning, deliberation, and relationship-building) in a different environment with others who share their views, is important. This is one way of building a 'plurality' of citizens (Bauman, 1999), whose strong views will create the 'agonism' or real debate that Mouffe says is lacking within European political life (Mouffe, 2005). The negative here of course, is that only the motivated and interested

students are likely to want to become involved, meaning that the majority may miss out on enriching democratic experiences at a formative stage.

4.5.4 Other school representative committees

The *FAU* (*Foreldrerådets arbeidsutvalg*), or parent council committee, represents the parent and student interests in the school. It is made up of parent representatives drawn from parents who represent each class within the school. There are some student representatives as well. They are there to support the principal in resolving problems with students and can also support students in other ways (the parent interviewed gave an example of running workshops around internet safety). So this is another way in which Norwegian students can participate in decision-making within the ungdomsskole. When the *FAU* parent representative of the case study school was asked about the knowledge and ability of participating students, he observed how capable they were, but believed that not all students were as capable or interested:

Yes, in the *FAU* there are three or four students, and they are highly motivated, articulate, and they are interested in everything. And I am impressed by their level of knowledge, and how they approach the problems or the topics we are discussing. And I hope that they are not the only ones in the school. But I think that it has always been like that [where some students are more interested than others].

Interview with parent representative FAU, September 2013

The principal talked about the *Brukerråd*, the User Council, as another way in which students are represented. The Trondheim municipality believes that schools should have a reasonable level of independence, and as a result this council is tasked with an oversight role considering the principles that should influence school business, and focusing on the quality of the services provided (Ressursenter, 2011). The council must include two representatives from the student council, two teachers, three parents chosen by the *FAU*, a representative of other school employees, and the principal. The principal talks about how council helps to shape the work he does and the things he focuses on:

PRINCIPAL: We also have a small organisation called the *Brukerråd*, the council for students and parents. There I can go and discuss how we do things, how to plan the budget, to listen to what the parents and the students mean about the different subjects, how they are doing it, optional subjects. In this mixed council, students and parents can come and give their opinions about, for example, the curriculum questionnaire we talked about, how the students find the school. Then I as a principal need to deal with the feedback that comes up in this council.

RESEARCHER: So how often do you meet with them?

PRINCIPAL: Two times [or] three times each semester.

RESEARCHER: Do you think meeting with them regularly helps you to get better results, in your [school climate] questionnaire?

PRINCIPAL: I hope so! [laughs]

RESEARCHER: Does it solve problems as they come up?

PRINCIPAL: I hope so. I get a really good impression of parents' opinions and interests and the students' interests and opinions, and how they want the school to be run, how they want it to work.

Interview with the principal, March 2013

Like the student council and political clubs discussed above, other representative committees also offer opportunities for motivated students to participate, gaining skills and understanding about democratic processes.

4.6 CONCLUSION

These rich findings create an impression of a school which incorporates many ways of teaching students about democratic practices and citizenship, surrounded by strong societal support for the value of democracy. From observations and interviews within the case study school, it appears that the philosophy of *Bildung* infuses democratic deliberation in a deep, nuanced way from storytelling to human relationships, interacting with the community in a variety of classroom and informal opportunities, from lengthy discussion, to essay writing, from school councils to teacher training and parent and home engagement. But *Bildung* is also still so powerful that there is little room for engaging in different perspectives or philosophies when it comes to discussing controversial issues like multiculturalism and begging.

Likewise, the lengths to which young people are involved in meaningful decision-making are contested. While there are a number of ways (some of them legislated) in which students can participate in decision-making, the staff determine how much power students are allowed to wield. Yet perhaps because teachers treat students with respect, there is little reaction from the students to actively address these imbalances. It also appears that some Norwegian teachers resent challenges to their autonomy, and are not always willing to recognise the benefits to students of negotiating and contributing their views to the learning process. There is also the perennial problem that some students want to contribute more, while others do not.

In Chapter 5, the discussion now turns to compare these qualitative snap shot findings of one *ungdomsskole* with the implications for teacher practice and wider democracy, and for other established democracies.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS FOR CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION AND DELIBERATIVE THEORY

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims to contribute to wider academic debate in this field. First, I answer the final research question by observing ways other established democracies could reflect on how they develop young people as participants in political life, drawn from how this Norwegian case study school teaches civic education and practises democracy. Second, I highlight the areas of discussion for Norway, and then for wider academic use and understanding.

As a researcher living in Norway for a year, and carrying out research in a school there, I had a unique opportunity to understand the Norwegian way of practising democracy and citizenship in the *ungdomsskole* setting. Receiving these insights meant gaining an understanding of how Norwegians might view us and our education system, in order to ask: what are the things they would find of note, and how might it help us to think critically about our own education policy and practices? In the words of Payne (2002: 120), there is a need to ‘consider what a small, often neglected, country, like Norway, which has nevertheless been at the cutting-edge of progressive educational reform in Europe for over a century, has to offer’.

5.2 REFLECTIONS FOR SCHOOLS AND POLICY-MAKERS IN OTHER ESTABLISHED DEMOCRACIES:

- Think about the existing curriculum – what is ‘null’ ie what areas are *not* covered? Would it make a difference if CE was a separate subject? What if subjects like Religion and Ethics were also taught to give better frameworks to support deliberative processes?
- Would legislating democratic practices in schools (such as student councils or student surveys) improve current levels of student participation?
- Do we involve students in significant decision-making within our schools (such as around teaching)? Why or why not?
- How much do we debate deliberatively in class, including about controversial issues? What are the barriers to doing this well (teacher competence, or cultural/societal/parental expectations or views)?
- What are the underlying ideologies that we accept in education today? Do they reinforce democratic learning?
- Do we encourage a *Bildung* approach to learning, inviting discourse, listening respectfully, encouraging personal reflection on the subjects we discuss? If not, would it be helpful if we did?
- How do we encourage citizenship and a sense of belonging in our young people? What societal rituals and traditions might strengthen this?
- Does the wider society also support democratic decision-making and practices in public institutions?

NORWEGIAN SUCCESSES AND CHALLENGES

5.2.1 Across the curriculum

In terms of the role of the constitution in emphasising freedom and equality for all Norwegian citizens, this is an important part of shaping a shared understanding within the school of what citizenship means. The wider society supporting and upholding values surrounding democracy plays a large part in this. Although I knew that their national day was significant for Norwegians, I did not anticipate how much the teaching and learning of citizenship and democracy in school could be based around participating in these experiences.

Negotiating learning outcomes with students is at present limited by Norwegian teachers' struggle with any change in education policy or legislation that they perceive as threatening to their autonomy. While this may have protected them to a degree from some of the neoliberal attitudes and models that have crept into the policy-speak of official documents (Stray, 2013), this approach also limits their ability to allow students more of a say in their learning. As a comparison, a New Zealand teacher-educator commented from her own research experiences that 'student-directed and autonomous practice combined with authentic experiences will yield far deeper learning outcomes than can be provided by a teacher-directed presentation' (Lewis, 2013: 75). However the start of Lewis' project was not promising as she faced early resistance from the trainees not wanting to choose how they would carry out the exercise. Perhaps Norwegian teachers also need to experience the power of determining their own learning approaches through professional development before they can see the value in allowing their students to choose how they will learn?

5.2.2 In the formal curriculum

The case study school showed how *Bildung* thinking influences the way in which citizenship education is taught. In spite of fears elsewhere that the cultural value of *Bildung* has been commodified like many other things in our neoliberal democracies (Pinar, 2011, Stray, 2013), in Norway teachers still see teaching as 'a matter of relations, interactions, communication and making sense of oneself, one's relations to other people and to the outer world' (Moos et al., 2013: 168). Norwegian teachers do not yet seem as subject to 'performativity' as other countries enrolled in the neoliberal experiment (Ball, 2003). The pace of teacher reform is slow, due to collective resistance to anything that might threaten teacher autonomy.

Within the classroom, the areas I have focused on in my research: *participatory learning*, *practising deliberation* (including controversial topics and storytelling), and the role of *personal relationships*, are all useful approaches for practitioners to consider when encouraging democratic practice. Considered together they can help teachers to strengthen the ways in which students participate and build democratic skills. In this next section I analyse the key ways in which the case study school used them and how they relate to other literature in this field.

Participatory learning, including class voting, group inquiry and fieldwork is evident in a number of ways in classrooms. However the teachers, principal and the education official all agreed that teachers could do more teaching using these approaches, and that there was still a certain amount of non-participatory teaching (rote learning, lecture-style teaching) going on (Print, 2012). Students

also felt more engaged in the learning and enjoyed it more when more participatory methods were used. The social studies teacher expressed a wish to expand the opportunities for quality field trips.

One of the key observations from this case study is that in teaching skills of *deliberation*, through discussion and debate, particularly around controversial issues, the *how* of teaching citizenship education can be as important as the *why* (echoing Bohman, 2009). While debates about defining citizenship and democracy continue to rage in academia, few discuss the equally meaty and very real problems of how you talk about difficult issues like whether wearing hijab should be allowed when one of your classmates is wearing one, as the professor interviewed for the case study noted (September 2013). Stray observed in Norway at least, teachers are struggling with the question of how best to teach in this area so perhaps they aren't covered as much in training as one assumes (conversation with Stray, October 2013). At least in Norway they are attempting to teach about these issues, while in other countries sometimes they are ignored altogether (Hess, 2004). Because citizenship education is about values and judgements, some of these issues are glossed over rather than addressing the challenge of how to teach about citizenship in a way that gives multiple perspectives and views, and deals with the messy things (like racist remarks) that the students may say or do in a classroom. An experienced teacher may cope with this confidently, as did the two teachers I observed, but for a newer teacher, working out how to present the material can be a challenge.

Some lessons observed in the case study school showed wide-ranging and interesting discussions being held. However there was also evidence of 'word games' where teachers asked about material covered previously and expected set answers. In his New Zealand guide on teachers and curriculum decision-making, McGee (1997) gives a similar example, and says that this kind of approach tends to 'foster compliant behaviour' rather than open-ended thinking.

While *storytelling* or the use of narrative is an accepted teaching method, it is seldom mentioned in the literature on citizenship education, although it features among some deliberative theorists (Young, 2001, Todd, 2011). From the case study observations, telling stories proved to be an important way to communicate values and personalise the issues, activating the students' 'sociological imaginations' (Wright Mills, 1970) to draw connections between their lives and wider constructs in society.

Relationships are central to good teaching about citizenship education, but this is an area that is somewhat lacking in the political literature with Hess (Hess and Posselt, 2002, 2011) probably the best promoter, though discussion of classroom relationships is much more evident in general literature on teaching (McGee, 1997). In the case study school, good relationship with the students appeared to be a strength of the teaching, as I observed the warmth, caring and enthusiasm the teachers displayed towards their students. The principal's comments too, reflected a respectful and understanding attitude, while the education official believed that these attitudes were typical in *ungdomsskolen* because teachers there liked to build relationships with and teach this age group.

What I observed in terms of relationship building in the classroom fits well with Aldenmyr et al.'s (2012: 263), reflections on their research in Swedish classrooms, and the fact that these ways of relating hold possibilities for developing a 'genuine, active citizenship':

A social climate that allows for closeness, open communication between individuals and the ability to question traditions holds possibilities for a genuine active citizenship, which serves both individual and collective interests. Teachers who strive to develop mutual relations with their students and show respect for students' own desires and integrity, can be good role models for a more compassionate and ethically sensitive way of acting.

Hess (2011) also supports the setting of norms, or classroom rules, and says that it is an essential part of the process of teaching young people how to participate in discussions. If teachers are modelling respect and inviting participation, they are showing students how adults can and should act in a democracy.

5.2.3 In the informal curriculum

Student councils allow a great many students to participate and learn the skills of decision-making on behalf of others. Yet despite being legislated for, their power is reduced because of a wider view that addressing or even discussing teaching issues are not within the realm of such a body. This limits the power of this group to effect significant change within the school. However other committees that a few students participate in, such as the *FAU* and the *Brukerråd*, mean that some important decisions are made about the school with the participation of a small number of students. Hayward (2012: 134) asks 'in a world of centred power, how do young citizens learn to judge whether their deliberation is having any effect?' Adults can support this process by ensuring that institutional arrangements for youthful deliberation are effective.

What students gain from being part of a political group is a huge amount of political capital – an awareness of the issues they are representing as part of the group; learning about social justice by pushing for change to society in particular areas; and learning how to represent others in the causes they support. But a key question to be addressed here is how these experiences can be offered to the wider student population, particularly if they are not motivated to take up these roles.

5.3 CONSIDERATIONS OF CE FOR OTHER ESTABLISHED DEMOCRACIES

The Norwegian constitution was developed based on the prior experiences of the French and American revolutions. These countries have constitutions that also emphasise personal rights and freedoms. However while constitutional rules promote citizenship rights it is the practice of democracy that strengthens what Ringen (2010) calls the 'elusive' creation of a democratic culture. *Bildung* underpins this as a particular kind of philosophical approach that challenges young people to think critically about their democratic values.

The *how* of teaching citizenship is a challenge for other established democracies too. Perhaps it is comforting to know that even in a democracy like Norway where so many topics are discussed openly, they too still have challenges. Teaching democracy effectively is not simply a matter of picking up a text book and having a test on civics and a constitution, it requires thought about deliberation in a context of shared values of inclusion.

Reflecting on this case, it seems that a large part of Norwegian society and culture is about listening and respecting others views (*Bildung*). The similarities with Nussbaum's model (2011) should not be

overlooked. Both of these approaches have a large emphasis that the development of the individual towards becoming a citizen is a process. Westheimer and Kahne's model (2004), on the other hand, is more about the desired outcomes of teaching citizenship education. As such, it was difficult to judge within the case study school the types of citizens they were directing students towards, because this was a snap shot view rather than a longitudinal study. More observations over time, along with further documentation (student assignments, and grades against curriculum outcomes) and specific discussion around outcomes with teachers would have been required to better judge how citizenship teaching in the ungdomsskole aimed towards these ideal citizen types.

Perhaps *Bildung* and societal support makes it easier for Norwegian teachers to uphold the importance of democratic values to their students. But it also underscores the importance for other established democracies that we can't expect our young people to learn these behaviours only in school. We should look at the way we view and value people more widely in society, and the way our institutions behave – do they model democratic behaviours as in Norway (Ringen, 2010)? Stray commented that deliberation is at the heart of Norwegian political processes (conversation with Stray, October 2013). This brings us back to the literature around deliberative democracy and where answers might be found further in addressing the questions of increasing pluralism within many established democratic societies today (Dryzek, 2005, Mouffe, 2005, Todd, 2011).

5.4 FINAL CONCLUSIONS

This small, qualitative case study set out to explore democratic practices and perspectives in a junior high school in Norway, while the researcher lived there for a year. What was found was a school where deeply-held beliefs about the value of democracy underpin teacher practice and societal and parent support for citizenship education. Alongside that is a teaching philosophy based on *Bildung*, focused on cultivating the individual mind so that they can contribute as citizens to the Norwegian polity.

However the challenges for Norway when it comes to continuing to develop young people as democratic citizens, are several, and not insignificant. The first challenge is about education reforms with an increasingly neoliberal agenda, creating a resistance to change amongst teachers that limits their ability to allow students to negotiate more about how they learn. Second is *Bildung's* ongoing relevance in a world of increasing multiculturalism and globalisation. Third, that Norwegian students would benefit from participating in more meaningful decision-making relating to their learning in school.

For the rest of us, living in other established democracies around the world, we would do well to reflect on the observations and discussions shared so freely by the school and recorded in this thesis. While we may not necessarily adopt *Bildung* and fundraising theme weeks, examining the practices of others different to ourselves helps us to consider the democratic values we hold, and to what extent we hold them. How might we realise the significance of our democracy, and likewise the democratic practices and understandings of citizenship taught to our young people in schools?

This Norwegian case study suggests that the values of *Bildung* implicitly inform approaches of participatory learning, practising deliberation and teachers' relationships with students, in ways

which support young people as they in turn learn to value democracy. The research concludes that these experiences help to equip *ungdomsskole* students observed in this case study with skills that they can use both immediately and in the future to participate as citizens in democratic processes and decision-making.

APPENDIX 1: PRINCIPAL QUESTIONS

Thanks very much for meeting with me. I am trying to learn how schools in Norway are teaching about democracy - to draw lessons from teachers' experiences for my Masters research.

1. How many students do you have here and what is the citizenship ethnic background of your students?
2. At what age do you think it is most appropriate for young people to begin to contribute to solving big problems/debates about things like climate change or immigration-why and in what ways?

Asking specifically about democracy:

3. In your experience as a Principal what are the most important values and skills (or experiences) you think children need to understand as they learn about democracy, and why?
4. There is a lot of debate about how to teach democracy – what do you find are the most effective ways to involve children in democratic decision making at school?
5. Can you give examples of when students have come up with solutions to problems, or influenced or changed outcomes through their involvement in a decision-making process at school or in their local community? Why do you think they were effective?

Turning to ideas about children learning to be good citizens in Norway:

6. I'm interested in the parts of the Norwegian curriculum that focus on developing children as good citizens (particularly in Social Studies, but also in other curriculum areas). What do you think are the most important parts that children need to understand?
7. Do you think that Norwegian young people are interested more generally in politics? Why or why not?
8. What changes would you like to see to the curriculum (if any), or support for schools in this area?
9. Is there anything you would like to see your school (or others) do differently to help young people develop skills and interest in participating in democratic processes?
10. Is there anything that you wish someone had told you about as a Principal in terms of teaching young people about becoming good citizens?
11. Any other comments?

APPENDIX 2: TEACHER QUESTIONS

- 1) There are a number of ways that people can participate in public life. Different countries and classrooms give different emphasis to these. How much emphasis do you give to each of these ways in your teaching - rank them from 1) not important to 5) very important:
 - a. Direct action (street marching/protest/via internet/petitions)
 - b. Voting
 - c. Volunteering
 - d. Political representative (at local/national level)
 - e. Interest group involvement
 - f. Civil service
 - g. Writing submissions on policy/law
 - h. Trade union involvement
 - i. Any others? _____

What topics did you give a 1, or a 5 and why? Is there anything else interesting about your list that you would like to comment on?

- 2) In your experience, how interested are students in learning about democracy, and becoming democratically active? What things stop them from being interested, do you think?
- 3) Do you think students today are more or less interested in politics or politically active than they have been in the past? Why, do you think?
- 4) What do you think is most important for your pupils to know and understand to be effective citizens here in Norway?
- 5) Do you discuss current local/national political events in class, including controversial ones?
[Further prompts: can you give examples of recent topics? How do you discuss them? Have students/parents responded or reacted in some way beyond class discussions?]
- 6) Outside of the formal classroom teaching, do the students participate in decision-making at your school? In what ways?
- 7) Do you use any community projects or outside groups learning programmes as a way of teaching young people about democracy/public participation? *[Please explain what they look like and involve. Do you think these are helpful why or why not?]*
- 8) What would you like to do more of, or differently, in teaching about democracy, and what stops you from doing that?
- 9) Will the new curriculum (2013) change anything about the way you teach politics and democracy competencies? Why/why not?

APPENDIX 3: STUDENT QUESTIONS

1. What groups are you involved in (both in and out of school) eg ski club, choir etc. List them all – note which ones (if any) are in-school.
2. What do you think politics is about?
3. Are you interested in politics? Why/why not? If yes, in what topics/areas and why?
4. What are the most interesting things you have learned/done in class in learning about democracy/participation (in social studies or religion/ethics)?
5. Are you involved in making decisions in class with your teachers about planning the lessons or how you work or the way your work is assessed? How much involvement do you have?
6. Do you think that it is important that students contribute to decision making in the school? Can you think of any recent examples in school by you or others to change or improve things for students? *What happened?*
7. Can you think of any recent political decisions that have affected you or your family?

APPENDIX 4: PARENT INFORMATION FORM

University of Canterbury

Department of Social and Political Sciences

PARENT/GUARDIAN INFORMATION

Your son/daughter is invited to participate as a subject in the research project '*Developing the capability of future citizens? Teaching democracy and political participation in Norwegian lower-secondary schools.*' The aim of this project is to find out about practices and perceptions of teaching and learning about democracy and political participation by teachers and young people in Norwegian *ungdomsskole*.

Your son's/daughter's involvement in this project will involve being part of a short class discussion or group interview on how they learn about democracy at their school. You have the right to withdraw them from the project at any time up until the thesis is finished or papers are published, including withdrawal of any information provided without penalty.

In the performance of the tasks and application of the procedures there are no risks involved. A Norwegian native speaker will be present to translate your son's/daughter's comments into English for the researcher and help answer any questions they may have about the project. They will be able to review the final transcript if they wish.

The results of the project may be published, and the finished thesis will be publically available. However, you may be assured of the complete confidentiality of data gathered in this investigation: the identity of participants will not be made public without you and your son's/daughter's consent. To ensure confidentiality, any documents and recordings made will be stored in a locked filing box in a locked cupboard, only accessible by the researcher (Elizabeth Plew) and one other researcher at the University of Oslo to help with translation (Dr Elin Selboe), and destroyed after five years.

The project is being carried out as a requirement for a Master of Arts degree in Political Science by Elizabeth Plew (Elizabeth.Plew@canterbury.ac.nz) ph 40551249 under the supervision of Dr Bronwyn Hayward, University of Canterbury, New Zealand who can be contacted at bronwyn.hayward@canterbury.ac.nz or Professor Karen O'Brien at the University of Oslo karen.obrien@sosgeo.uio.no phone 22858480. They will be pleased to discuss any concerns you may have about participation in the project.

The project has been reviewed **and approved** by the University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee, New Zealand.

APPENDIX 5: CONSENT FORM

University of Canterbury & Departmental Letterhead

Elizabeth Plew

Elizabeth.Plew@canterbury.ac.nz

[Date]

CONSENT FORM

Developing the capability of future citizens? Teaching democracy and political participation in Norwegian lower-secondary schools.

I have read and understood the description of the above-named project. On this basis I agree to participate as a subject in the project, and I consent to publication of the results of the project with the understanding that confidentiality will be preserved.

I understand that the raw data collected will only be accessible by the researcher (Elizabeth Plew) and one other researcher at the University of Oslo to help with translation (Dr Elin Selboe), and destroyed after five years.

I understand also that I may at any time withdraw from the project, including withdrawal of any information I have provided, up until the thesis is finished or papers are published.

I note that the project has been reviewed **and approved** by the University of Canterbury Human Ethics Committee.

NAME (please print):

Signature:

Date:

APPENDIX 6: TEACHER QUESTIONS (NORWEGIAN)

Intervjuspørsmål til lærere

- 1) Man kan engasjere seg i det offentlige liv på mange måter. Ulike land og klasserom vektlegger forskjellige ting. Hvor mye fokus setter du på hver av disse måtene i din undervisning – ranger dem fra 1) ikke viktig til 5) veldig viktig:

| | Grade |
|---|-------|
| j. Direkte aksjon (opptog / protest / via internett / underskriftskampanje) | ___ |
| k. Å stemme ved valg | ___ |
| l. Frivillig arbeid | ___ |
| m. Å stille som politisk representant (på lokalt / nasjonalt nivå) | ___ |
| n. Engasjement i interessergrupper | ___ |
| o. Siviltjeneste | ___ |
| p. Å skrive meningsytrende brev til politikere | ___ |
| q. Å delta i fagforeninger | ___ |
| r. Noe annet? _____ | ___ |

Hvilke punkt ga du 1 eller 5, og hvorfor? Er det noe annet interessant ved listen som du ønsker å kommentere?

- 2) Ut ifra din erfaring, hvor interesserte er elevene i å lære om demokrati og å bli demokratisk aktive? Hva hindrer dem eventuelt i å interessere seg for det, tror du?
- 3) Syns du dagens elever er interesserte i politikk og politisk engasjerte i større eller mindre grad enn før? Hvorfor er det slik, tror du?
- 4) Hva syns du er viktigst for elevene å vite og forstå for å kunne bli aktive samfunnsborgere her i Norge?
- 5) Diskuterer dere aktuell lokal/nasjonal politikk i klassen, inkludert kontroversielle temaer? *[Utvidet: kan du gi eksempler på nylige temaer? Hvordan diskuteres de? Har elever/foresatte respondert eller reagert på noen måte utenfor klassediskusjoner?]*
- 6) Er elevene med på å ta avgjørelser på skolen utenom formell klasseromsundervisning? På hvilke måter?
- 7) Bruker du noen gang ressurser i lokalsamfunnet utenfor skolen til å undervise om demokrati / offentlig engasjement og deltagelse? *(Beskriv gjerne hvordan disse ressursene ser ut og hva de innebærer. Er de til hjelp? Hvorfor / Hvorfor ikke?)*
- 8) Hva skulle du gjerne gjort mer av eller annerledes når det gjelder undervisning om demokrati? Hva stopper deg eventuelt fra å få til dette?
- 9) Tror du den reviderte læreplanen (2013) vil endre din undervisningspraksis i henhold til politikk og demokratikompetanse? Hvorfor/Hvorfor ikke?

APPENDIX 7: PARENT INFORMATION FORM (NORWEGIAN)

University of Canterbury, New Zealand

Department for Samfunns- og Statsvitenskap

INFORMASJON TIL FORELDRE/FORESATTE

Din sønn/datter er invitert til å delta som informant i forskningsprosjektet «Developing the capability of future citizens? Teacher and student evaluations of democracy and participation in Norwegian lower-secondary schools» (Utvikles framtidige borgeres kapabilitet? Lærer- og elevevalueringer av demokrati og politisk engasjement ved norske ungdomsskoler). Målet med prosjektet er å undersøke elevers og læreres utøvelse og oppfatning rundt undervisning og læring om demokrati og politisk engasjement ved norske ungdomsskoler.

Din sønns/datters bidrag til dette prosjektet vil involvere å være med i en kort klassediskusjon eller i et kort gruppeintervju en times tid for å snakke om hvordan du oppfatter at demokrati undervises ved din skole og hva du tenker om demokrati og politisk engasjement. Du kan når som helst trekke din datter/sønn fra prosjektet eller trekke tilbake informasjon hun eller han har gitt når som helst fram til den ferdige avhandlingen eller andre tekster publiseres, uten at det får noen konsekvenser.

For din sønn/datter som informant er det ingen risiko involvert i aktivitetene knyttet til prosjektet. En norsk morsmålsbruker vil være tilgjengelig for å oversette kommentarene dine til engelsk for forskeren. Om du ønsker, kan du se over den transkriberte teksten når den blir tilgjengelig.

Resultatet av prosjektet vil bli publisert, og den endelige avhandlingen vil være allment tilgjengelig. Du kan allikevel være sikker på at all innsamlet data vil behandles konfidensielt: Informanters identitet vil ikke offentliggjøres uten ditt samtykke som forelder/foresatt. For å sikre konfidensialitet vil også alle dokumenter og opptak oppbevares i et låst skap som bare forsker (Elizabeth Plew) og én annen forsker ved Universitetet i Oslo som bidrar med oversettelse (Dr Elin Selboe) har tilgang til. Etter fem år blir alle data slettet.

Prosjektet blir gjennomført som en obligatorisk del av en mastergrad i statsvitenskap av Elizabeth Plew (plew.elizabeth@gmail.com tlf 40551249) under veiledning av Dr. Bronwyn Harward, som kan kontaktes via e-post (bronwyn.hayward@canterbury.ac.nz). Alternativt kan professor Karen O'Brien ved Universitetet i Oslo kontaktes (karen.obrien@sosgeo.uio.no), tlf 22858480). De vil ikke ha noe imot å diskutere spørsmål du har rundt å delta i prosjektet.

Prosjektet har blitt evaluert og godkjent av University of Canterbury's forskningsetiske komité, New Zealand.

APPENDIX 8: CONSENT FORM (NORWEGIAN)

University of Canterbury

Elizabeth Plew

plew.elizabeth@gmail.com

«Developing the capability of future citizens? Teacher and student evaluations of democracy and participation in Norwegian lower-secondary schools» (Utvikles framtidige borgeres kapabilitet? Lærer- og elevenvalueringer av demokrati og politisk engasjement ved norske ungdomsskoler).

Samtykkeskjema

Jeg har lest og forstått beskrivelsen av prosjektet som er nevnt ovenfor. På denne bakgrunn enige jeg til å delta som deltager i prosjektet, og jeg samtykke til offentliggjøring av resultatene fra prosjektet med den forståelse at konfidensialitet vil bli holdt.

Jeg forstår at alle dokumenter og opptak oppbevares i et låst skap som bare forsker (Elizabeth Plew) og én annen forsker ved Universitetet i Oslo som bidrar med oversettelse (Dr Elin Selboe) har tilgang til. Etter fem år blir alle data slettet.

Jeg forstår også at jeg kan trekke meg fra prosjektet eller trekke tilbake informasjon når som helst fram til den ferdige avhandlingen eller andre tekster publiseres.

Jeg merker at prosjektet har blitt evaluert og godkjent av University of Canterbury's forskningsetiske komité, New Zealand.

NAVN (skrive ut):

Underskrift:.....

Dato:...../...../.....

REFERENCES

- Aalberg, T., Iyengar, S. & Messing, S. (2012) Who is a 'Deserving' Immigrant? An Experimental Study of Norwegian Attitudes. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 35, 97-116.
- Ainley, J., Friedman, T., Kerr, D. & Schulz, W. (2012) Assessing the intended participation of young adolescents as future citizens: Comparing results from 26 European countries. *European Conference on Educational Research 2012*.
- Aldenmyr, S. I., Wigg, U. J. & Olson, M. (2012) Worries and possibilities in active citizenship: Three Swedish educational contexts. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 7, 255-270.
- Alton-Lee, A. (2001) Research ethics, classroom research and educational practice. In: Tolich, M. (ed.) *Research Ethics in Aotearoa New Zealand: Concepts, Practice, Critique*. Auckland: Pearson Education New Zealand.
- Apple, M. W. & Beane, J. (2007) The Case for Democratic Schools. In: Apple, M. W. & Beane, J. (eds.) *Democratic Schools: Lessons in Powerful Education* 2nd ed. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Avery, P. (2002) Political Tolerance, Democracy, and Adolescents. In: Parker, W. C. (ed.) *Education for Democracy: contexts, curricula, assessments*. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing.
- Ball, S. (2003) The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Educational Policy*, 18, 215-228.
- Barber, B. (1984) *Strong Democracy: participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Barnes, C., Mercer, G. & Shakespeare, T. (1999) Understanding Disability. *Exploring Disability: A Sociological Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bassey, M. (1999) *Case study research in educational settings*. Guildford, UK: Biddles Ltd.
- Bauman, Z. (1999) *In Search of Politics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bell, B. L. (2005) Children, youth, and civic (dis)engagement: Digital technology and citizenship. CRACIN Working paper No. 5. Canadian Research Alliance for Community Innovation and Networking.
- Bell, L. A. (2010) *Storytelling for Social Justice: Connecting Narrative and the Arts in Antiracist Teaching*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Biesta, G. (2002) Bildung and Modernity: The Future of Bildung in a World of Difference. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21, 343-351.
- Blais, A. & Rubenson, D. (2013) The Source of Turnout Decline: New Values or New Contexts? *Comparative Political Studies*, 46, 95-117.
- Bohman, J. (2009) Epistemic Value and Deliberative Democracy. *The Good Society*, 18, 28-34.

- Bolzan, N. (2010) Young People's Citizenship. *Women in Welfare Education*, 9, 50-62.
- Børhaug, K. (2008) Educating voters: political education in Norwegian upper secondary schools. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 40, 579-600.
- Calenda, D. & Mosca, L. (2007) Youth online : researching the political use of the Internet in the Italian context *In: Loader, B. (ed.) Young citizens in the digital age : political engagement, young people, and new media*. New York: Routledge.
- Carpini, M., Cook, F. & Jacobs, L. (2004) Public deliberation, discursive participation, and citizen engagement: A review of the empirical literature. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7, 315-44.
- Catt, H. (2005) Children and young people as citizens: Participation, provision and protection. *6th Child and Family Policy Conference*. University of Otago, Dunedin: NZ Electoral Commission.
- Catt, H. (2006) Participation and Citizenship. *In: Miller, R. (ed.) New Zealand Government and Politics*. 4th ed. Melbourne, Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Chawla, L. (2009) Participation as capacity-building for active citizenship. *Les Ateliers de L'Ethique*, 4, 69-76.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dahlgren, P. (2013) *The Political Web: Media, Participation and Alternative Democracy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Deakin Crick, R. & Wilson, K. (2005) Being a Learner: A Virtue for the 21st Century. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53, 359-374.
- Delwit, P. (2013) The End of Voters in Europe? Electoral Turnout in Europe since WWII. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 44-52.
- Dryzek, J. S. (2004) Pragmatism and Democracy: In Search of Deliberative Publics. *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 18, 72-79.
- Dryzek, J. S. (2005) Deliberative Democracy in Divided Societies: Alternatives to Agonism and Analgesia. *Political Theory*, 33, 218-242.
- EACEA (2012) Citizenship Education in Europe. Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency,.
- Eurydice (2005) Citizenship Education At School In Europe. Brussels: Eurydice European Unit.
- Evans, M. (2006) Educating for citizenship: What teachers say and what teachers do. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 29, 410-435.
- Faden, L. Y. (2012) Teachers constituting the politicized subject: Canadian and US teachers' perspectives on the 'good' citizen. *Citizenship Teaching & Learning*, 7, 173-189.

- Faulks, K. (2006) Rethinking citizenship education in England. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 1, 123-140.
- Fjeldstad, D., Lauglo, J. & Mikkelsen, R. (2009) Demokratisk Beredskap: Kortrapport om norske ungdomsskolelevers prestasjoner og svar på spørsmål i den internasjonale demokratiundersøkelsen. Oslo: ICCS IEA 2009.
- Flanagan, C. A. (2013) *teenage citizens: The Political Theories of the Young*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Flick, U. (2007) Sampling, selecting and access. *Designing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Gallego, A. (2009) Where Else Does Turnout Decline Come From? Education, Age, Generation and Period Effects in Three European Countries. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 32, 23-44.
- Gearon, L. (2010) Politics and Pedagogy: Citizenship beyond the classroom. In: Gearon, L. (ed.) *Learning to Teach Citizenship in the Classroom: A companion to school experience*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gerodimos, R. & Ward, J. (2007) Engagement: reflections on web content analysis. In: Loader, B. (ed.) *Young citizens in the digital age : political engagement, young people, and new media*. New York: Routledge.
- Gillham, B. (2000) *Case Study Research Methods*. London: Continuum.
- Global Finance. (2013) *The World's Richest and Poorest Countries* [Online]. Global Finance. Available: <http://www.gfmag.com/tools/global-database/economic-data/11934-richest-poorest-countries.html#axzz2PIsSozUU> [Accessed 2/4/2013].
- Goodson, I. & Deakin Crick, R. (2009) Curriculum as narration: tales from the children of the colonised. *The Curriculum Journal*, 20, 225-236.
- Gray, D. E. (2004) *Doing Research in the Real World*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Gutmann, A. (1999) *Democratic Education (Revised Edition)*. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Gutmann, A. & Thompson, D. (2004) *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hayward, B. (2012) *Children, Citizenship and Environment: Nurturing a Democratic Imagination in a Changing World*. London: Earthscan/Routledge.
- Hayward, J. (2010) Beginning to teach citizenship. In: Gearon, L. (ed.) *Learning to teach citizenship in the secondary school*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hellevik, O. (1996) Nordmenn og det gode liv. Norsk monitor 1985 - 1995. Med innspill fra Odd Børretzen. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

- Hess, D. (2004) Controversies about Controversial Issues in Democratic Education. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 37, 257-261.
- Hess, D. (2011) Discussions That Drive Democracy. *Educational Leadership*, 69, 69-73.
- Hess, D. & Posselt, J. (2002) How High School Students experience and learn from the discussion of controversial public issues. *Journal of Curriculum & Supervision*, 17, 283.
- Heywood, A. (2004) *Political Theory: An introduction*. Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hibbing, J. & Theiss-Morse, E. (2002) *Stealth Democracy: American's beliefs about how democracy should work*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holliday, A. (2002) *Doing and Writing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- hooks, b. (1989) *Talking back: thinking feminist, thinking black*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Huitson, O. (2013) *Russell Brand, populism and a collapsing centre* [Online]. Available: <http://www.opendemocracy.net/ourkingdom/oliver-huitson/russell-brand-populism-and-collapsing-centre> [Accessed 28/12/2013].
- Hyslop-Margison, E. & Dale, J. (2010) *Paulo Freire: Teaching for freedom and transformation*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Jackson, R. & Steele, K. (2004) Problems and Possibilities for Relating Citizenship Education and Religious Education in Europe. *Teaching for Tolerance, Respect and Recognition in relation with Religion or Belief*. Oslo: The Oslo Coalition on Freedom of Religion or Belief.
- Johansson, O., Holmgren, M., Nihlfors, E., Moos, L., Skedsmo, G., Paulsen, J. & Risku, M. (2013) Local Decisions Under Central Watch: a Nordic Quality Assurance System. In: Moos, L. (ed.) *Transnational Influences on Values and Practices in Nordic Educational Leadership: Is there a Nordic Model?* Dordrecht: Springer.
- Johnson, P. R., Boyer, M. A. & Brown, S. W. (2011) Vital interests: cultivating global competence in the international studies classroom. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9, 503-519.
- Joseph, P. B. (2011) *Cultures of Curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Kahne, J. E. & Sporte, S. E. (2008) Developing Citizens: The Impact of Civic Learning Opportunities on Students' Commitment to Civic Participation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 45, 738-766.
- Kerr, D., Ireland, E., Lopes, J. & Craig, R. (2004) Citizenship Education Longitudinal Study: Second Annual Report: First Longitudinal Survey MAKING CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION REAL. UK: National Foundation for Educational Research.
- King, G., Keohane, R. & Verba, S. (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Knight, P. T. (2002) *Small-Scale Research*. Guildford, UK: Biddles Ltd.

- Kunnskapsdepartementet, M. o. E. (1998) The Education Act.
- Kymlicka, W. (2002) *Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen, B. E. & Timothy, A. (2011) *Instructional Strategies for Middle and Secondary Social Studies*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis.
- Lauglo, J. & Øia, T. (2007) Education and Civic Engagement: Review of Research and a Study on Norwegian Youths. *OECD education working papers*. Oslo: NOVA.
- Levine, P. (2003) The Civic Mission of Schools. *Community Building*, 63-66.
- Lewis, L. (2013) Social Sciences and the key competencies: a practitioner reflects. *Curriculum Matters*, 9, 64-81.
- Lister, R., Williams, F. & Anttonen, P. A. (2007) Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe : New Challenges for Citizenship Research in a Cross-National Context. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Listhaug, O. & Grønflaten, L. (2007) Civic Decline? Trends in Political Involvement and Participation in Norway, 1965–2001. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30, 272-299.
- Llewellyn, K. & Westheimer, J. (2009) Beyond Facts and Acts: The Implications of 'Ordinary Politics' for Youth Political Engagement. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 5, 50-61.
- Mansbridge, J. (1990) The Rise and Fall of Self-Interest in the Explanation of Political Life. In: Mansbridge, J. (ed.) *Beyond Self-Interest*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Masschelein, J. & Ricken, N. (2003) Do We (Still) Need the Concept of Bildung? *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 35, 139-154.
- McFarland, D. A. & Starmanns, C. (2009) Inside student goverment: The variable quality of high school student councils. *Teachers College Record*, 111, 27-54.
- McFarland, D. A. & Thomas, R. J. (2006) Bowling Young: How Youth Voluntary Associations Influence Adult Political Participation. *American Sociological Review*, 71, 401-425.
- McGee, C. (1997) *Teachers and Curriculum Decision-Making*. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- McQueen, M. (2013) The Persuasive Power of Narrative: 6 keys to using stories to impact and inspire. Available: <http://michaelmcqueen.net/about/resources.html>.
- Mims, A. (2013) *Russell Brand: Democracy Isn't Working, Politicians Serve Corporations not Constituents* [Online]. Available: <http://www.ringoffireradio.com/2013/10/russell-brand-democracy-isnt-working-politicians-serve-corporations-constituents/> [Accessed 28/12/2013].
- Moller, J. & Skedsmo, G. (2013) Norway: Centralisation and Decentralisation as Twin Reform Strategies. In: Moos, L. (ed.) *Transnational Influences on Values and Practices in Nordic Educational Leadership: Is there a Nordic Model?* Dordrecht: Springer.

- Moos, L. (2003) Educational leadership: leadership for/as Bildung? *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 6, 19-33.
- Moos, L. (2013) Postlude: Wrap-up of the argument. In: Moos, L. (ed.) *Transnational Influences on Values and Practices in Nordic Educational Leadership: Is there a Nordic Model?* Dordrecht: Springer.
- Moos, L., Johansson, O. & Skedsmo, G. (2013) Successful Nordic School Leadership. In: Moos, L. (ed.) *Transnational Influences on Values and Practices in Nordic Educational Leadership: Is there a Nordic Model?* Dordrecht: Springer.
- Mouffe, C. (2005) *On the political*. New York: Routledge.
- Mouffe, C. (2009) Democracy in a Multipolar World. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 37, 549-561.
- Mouffe, C. (2013) *Five Minutes with Chantal Mouffe: "Most countries in Europe are in a post-political situation"* [Online]. London School of Economics and Political Science. Available: <http://bit.ly/18midhv> [Accessed 2/3/2014].
- Mrnjaus, K. (2012) Teacher Competences for Education for Democratic Citizenship. In: Print, M. & Lange, D. (eds.) *Schools, Curriculum and Civic Education for Building Democratic Citizens*. SensePublishers.
- Mutch, C. (2003) Citizenship Education in New Zealand: inside or outside the curriculum? *Citizenship, social and economics education*, 5, 164.
- Norberg, K. & Johansson, O. (2010) The ethical dimensions of curriculum leadership in Scandinavian countries. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48, 327-336.
- Norris, P. (2003) *Democratic Phoenix: Reinventing Political Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Norris, P. (2011) *Democratic Deficit : Critical Citizens Revisited*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1997) *Cultivating humanity : a classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2006) Education and Democratic Citizenship: Capabilities and Quality Education. *Journal of Human Development*, 7, 385-395.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2009) Education for Profit, Education for Freedom. *Liberal Education*, 95, 6-13.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2011) *Creating capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Harvard University Press.
- OECD (2010) *OECD Reviews of Migrant Education: Norway 2010*. OECD Publishing.
- OECD (2011) *School education in Norway*. OECD Publishing.

- Olssen, M. (2001) Citizenship and Education: from Alfred Marshall to Iris Marion Young. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 33, 77-94.
- Osler, A. & Starkey, H. (2006) Education for Democratic Citizenship: a review of research, policy and practice 1995-2005. *Research Papers in Education*, 24, 433-466.
- Osler, A. & Zhu, J. (2011) Narratives in teaching and research for justice and human rights. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 6, 223-235.
- Østerud, Ø. (2005) Introduction: The peculiarities of Norway. *West European Politics*, 28, 705-720.
- Østerud, Ø. & Selle, P. (2006) Power and Democracy in Norway: The Transformation of Norwegian Politics¹. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 29, 25-46.
- Payne, J. (2002) A Tale of Two Curriculums: Putting the English and Norwegian curriculum models to the test of the 'high skills' vision. *Journal of Education and Work*, 15, 117-143.
- Pinar, W. F. (2011) *The Character of Curriculum Studies*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Print, M. (2012) Teacher Pedagogy and Achieving Citizenship Competences in Schools. In: Print, M. & Lange, D. (eds.) *Schools, Curriculum and Civic Education for Building Democratic Citizens*. SensePublishers.
- Putnam, R. (1995) Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6, 65-78.
- Ressursenter, A. S. o. (2011) Lokal handlingsplan, Skole-Heim. Trondheim: Asveien skole og ressursenter.
- Ringen, S. (2010) Democracy in Norway. *Taiwan Journal of Democracy*, 6, 43-55.
- Schuitema, J., Boxtel, C., Veugelers, W. & Dam, G. (2011) The quality of student dialogue in citizenship education. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 26, 85-107.
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D. & Losito, B. (2010) ICCS 2009 International Report: Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower-secondary school students in 38 countries. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Scott, J. (2010) Student Ownership of Education: Practicing Democracy in Schools. *Education Canada*, 49, 36-38.
- Sellar, S. & Lingard, B. (2013) Looking East: Shanghai, PISA 2009 and the reconstitution of reference societies in the global education policy field. *Comparative Education*, 49, 464-485.
- Sim, J. B.-Y. (2010) 'Simple Ideological "Dupes" of National Governments'? Teacher Agency and Citizenship Education in Singapore. In: Kennedy, K., Lee, W. & Grossman, D. (eds.) *Citizenship Pedagogies in Asia and the Pacific*. Hong Kong: Springer.
- Solhaug, T. (2012) Political alienation among migrant youths: Exploring the mechanisms of political alienation and acculturation among migrant youths in Norwegian schools. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 7, 3-18.

- Solhaug, T. (2013) Trends and Dilemmas in Citizenship Education. *Nordidactica*, 180-200.
- Statistics Norway. (2013) *Population and quarterly changes, Q4 2012* [Online]. Statistics Norway. Available: <http://www.ssb.no/en/befolkning/statistikker/folkendrkv/kvartal> [Accessed 2/04/2013].
- Stevenson, N. (2003) *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Questions*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Stevenson, N. (2010) Education, neoliberalism and cultural citizenship: Living in 'X Factor' Britain. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13, 341-358.
- Stojanov, K. (2012) The Concept of Bildung and Its Moral Implications. In: Schneider, K. (ed.) *Becoming oneself*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Stoker, G., Mason, A. & McGrew, A. (2011) *Prospects for Citizenship*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Stray, J. (2010) Education for Democratic Citizenship in Norway. *Education and Citizenship in a Globalising World*. London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Stray, J. (2013) Democratic citizenship in the Norwegian curriculum. A comparison between international and national policy recommendations for strengthening democracy through education. In: Bjoernestad, E. & Stray, J. H. (eds.) *New voices in Norwegian educational research*. In press: Sense Publishers.
- SWF, I. (2014) *Largest Sovereign Wealth Funds by Assets Under Management* [Online]. <http://www.swfinstitute.org/fund-rankings/>: Sovereign Wealth fund Institute. [Accessed 20/3/2014].
- Telhaug, A. O., Mediås, O. A. & Aasen, P. (2004) From collectivism to individualism? education as nation building in a Scandinavian perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 48, 141-158.
- Thornberg, R. & Elvstrand, H. (2012) Children's experiences of democracy, participation, and trust in school. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 53, 44-54.
- Thorsen, D. E. & Lie, A. (2006) *What is Neoliberalism?* Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Todd, S. (2006) Unveiling Cross-Cultural Conflict: Gendered Cultural Practice in Polycultural Society. *Philosophy of Education Yearbook*, 283-291.
- Todd, S. (2011) Educating Beyond Cultural Diversity: Redrawing the Boundaries of a Democratic Plurality. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 30, 101-111.
- Tolich, M. & Davidson, C. (2011) *Getting Started: An introduction to research methods*. Auckland: Pearson.
- Tønnesson, K. (2001) The Norwegian Constitution of 17 May 1814—international influences and models. *Parliaments, Estates and Representation*, 21, 175-186.

- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H. & Schulz, W. (2001) *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam: IEA.
- Torney-Purta, J. & Richardson, W. K. (2004) *Anticipated Political Engagement among Adolescents in Australia, England, Norway and the United States*. In: Demaine, J. (ed.) *Citizenship and Political Education Today*. London: Palgrave/Macmillan.
- Tranvik, T. & Selle, P. (2007) The Rise and Fall of Popular Mass Movements: Organizational Change and Globalization: The Norwegian Case. *Acta Sociologica*, 50, 57-70.
- Trondheim Kommune. (2013) *Participation* [Online]. Trondheim Kommune. Available: <http://www.trondheim.kommune.no/content.ap?thisId=1117728980> [Accessed 19/03/2013].
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2011) *Primary and lower secondary education curricula* [Online]. The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training / Utdanningsdirektoratet. Available: <http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/> [Accessed 3/4/2013].
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2013a) *Læreplan i samfunnsfag - kompetansemål* [Online]. Available: <http://www.udir.no/kl06/SAF1-03/Kompetansemaal/?arst=98844765&kmsn=583858936> [Accessed 23/10/2013].
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2013b) *Skoleporten (School Portal)* [Online]. The Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (Utdanningsdirektoratet). Available: <http://skoleporten.udir.no/> [Accessed 19/03/2013].
- Utdanningsdirektoratet. (2013c) *Valgfag - seks nye læreplaner* [Online]. Utdanningsdirektoratet. Available: <http://www.udir.no/Lareplaner/Finn-lareplan/endringer/Valgfag---seks-nye-lareplaner/> [Accessed 31/10/13].
- Varkøy, Ø. (2010) The concept of 'Bildung'. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 18, 85-96.
- Verba, S. & Nie, N. H. (1972) *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Verba, S., Scholzman, K. & Brady, H. (1995) *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Views and News staff. (2010) Norway tops in volunteerism. *News in English.no*.
- Vowles, J. (2004) *Civic Engagement in New Zealand: Decline or Demise?* University of Auckland.
- Vowles, J. (2010) Electoral System Change, Generations, Competitiveness and Turnout in New Zealand, 1963–2005. *British Journal of Political Science*, 40, 875-895.
- Waddington, D. I. (2010) Uncovering Hegelian Connections: A New Look at Dewey's Early Educational Ideas. *Education & Culture*, 26, 67-81.
- Westheimer, J. (2010) No Child Left Thinking: Democracy At-Risk in American Schools. *Education Canada*, 5-8.

- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J. (2004) What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41, 237-269.
- Wiborg, S. (2012) Neo-liberalism and universal state education: the cases of Denmark, Norway and Sweden 1980–2011. *Comparative Education*, 49, 407-423.
- Wollebæk, D. & Selle, P. (2003) Participation and Social Capital Formation: Norway in a Comparative Perspective¹. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 26, 67-91.
- Wood, B. E. (2010) Youth participation in society: Everyday citizenship perspectives from young people in New Zealand. *New Zealand Sociology*, 25, 103-124.
- Wood, B. E. (2012) Scales of active citizenship: New Zealand teachers' diverse perceptions and practices. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, 8, 77-93.
- Wright Mills, C. (1970) *The Sociological Imagination*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Yin, R. (2009) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. London: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R. (2012) *Applications of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Young, I. M. (2001) Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy. *Political Theory*, 29, 670-690.